

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, April 3, 1985

The House met at 3 p.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We ask for Your blessing, Almighty God, not because we are worthy, but because You have promised to love us as we are. In spite of our faults we yet turn to You, O God, that You will forgive our wrong acts or selfish deeds, and turn us to the paths of new life and good works. Help us not to be content with the ordinary, but allow us to do what is pleasing in Your sight and worthy of our calling; as Your people. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 155, answered "present" 3, not voting 28, as follows:

## (Roll No. 46)

## YEAS—246

Ackerman	Boggs	Chappell
Addabbo	Boland	Coelho
Akaka	Boner (TN)	Coleman (TX)
Alexander	Bonior (MI)	Collins
Anderson	Bonker	Conyers
Andrews	Borski	Cooper
Annunzio	Bosco	Coyne
Anthony	Boucher	Craig
Applegate	Boxer	Daniel
Aspin	Breaux	Darden
Atkins	Brooks	Daschle
AuCoin	Broomfield	de la Garza
Barnard	Brown (CA)	Dicks
Barnes	Bruce	Dingell
Bates	Bryant	Dixon
Bedell	Burton (CA)	Donnelly
Beilenson	Bustamante	Dorgan (ND)
Bennett	Byron	Dowdy
Berman	Callahan	Downey
Bevill	Carper	Duncan
Blaggi	Carr	Dwyer

Dyson	Lantos	Rodino
Early	Leath (TX)	Roe
Eckart (OH)	Lehman (CA)	Rose
Edgar	Lehman (FL)	Rostenkowski
Edwards (CA)	Leland	Rowland (GA)
Erdreich	Levin (MI)	Roybal
Evans (IL)	Levine (CA)	Russo
Fascell	Lewis (CA)	Savage
Fazio	Lipinski	Scheuer
Feighan	Lloyd	Schumer
Flippo	Lowry (WA)	Seiberling
Florio	Luken	Sharp
Foglietta	Lundine	Shuster
Foley	MacKay	Slusky
Ford (TN)	Manton	Skeen
Fowler	Markey	Skelton
Frank	Martinez	Slattery
Frost	Matsui	Smith (FL)
Fuqua	Mavroules	Smith (IA)
Garcia	Mazzoli	Snyder
Gaydos	McCurdy	Solarz
Gejdenson	McGrath	Spratt
Gephardt	McHugh	St Germain
Gibbons	Meyers	Staggers
Glickman	Mica	Stallings
Gonzalez	Michel	Stark
Gordon	Miller (CA)	Stenholm
Gray (IL)	Mineta	Stokes
Gray (PA)	Moakley	Stratton
Guarini	Mollohan	Studds
Hall (OH)	Montgomery	Swift
Hall, Ralph	Moody	Synar
Hall, Sam	Moore	Tallon
Hamilton	Morrison (CT)	Tauzin
Hammerschmidt	Mrazek	Thomas (GA)
Hansen	Murphy	Torres
Hatcher	Murtha	Torricelli
Hawkins	Myers	Towns
Hayes	Natcher	Traffant
Hefner	Neal	Traxler
Heftel	Nelson	Udall
Hertel	Nichols	Valentine
Hillis	Nowak	Vento
Horton	O'Brien	Visclosky
Howard	Oaker	Volkmer
Hoyer	Obey	Walgren
Hubbard	Olin	Watkins
Hughes	Owens	Waxman
Hutto	Panetta	Weaver
Jenkins	Pease	Weiss
Johnson	Perkins	Wheat
Jones (OK)	Petri	Whitley
Jones (TN)	Pickle	Williams
Kanjorski	Price	Wilson
Kaptur	Quillen	Wirth
Kastenmeier	Rahall	Wolpe
Kennelly	Rangel	Wright
Kildee	Ray	Wyden
Kleczka	Reid	Wyllie
Kostmayer	Richardson	Yatron
LaFalce	Robinson	Young (MO)

## NAYS—155

Cobey	Fish
Coble	Gallo
Coleman (MO)	Gekas
Combest	Gilman
Conte	Gingrich
Coughlin	Gradison
Crane	Green
Dannemeyer	Gregg
Daub	Grotberg
Davis	Gunderson
DeLay	Hendon
DeWine	Henry
Dickinson	Hill
Dornan (CA)	Holt
Dreier	Hopkins
Durbin	Huckaby
Eckert (NY)	Hunter
Edwards (OK)	Hyde
Emerson	Ireland
Fawell	Jacobs
Fiedler	Jeffords
Fields	Kasich

Kemp	Monson	Siljander
Kindness	Moorhead	Slaughter
Kramer	Morrison (WA)	Smith (NH)
Lagomarsino	Nielson	Smith (NJ)
Lent	Oxley	Smith, Denny
Lewis (FL)	Packard	Smith, Robert
Lightfoot	Parris	Snowe
Livingston	Pashayan	Solomon
Loeffler	Penny	Spence
Lott	Porter	Stangeland
Lowery (CA)	Pursell	Strang
Lujan	Regula	Stump
Lungren	Ridge	Sundquist
Mack	Rinaldo	Sweeney
Madigan	Ritter	Swindall
Marlenee	Roberts	Tauke
Martin (IL)	Roemer	Taylor
Martin (NY)	Rogers	Thomas (CA)
McCain	Roth	Vander Jagt
McCandless	Roukema	Vucanovich
McCollum	Rowland (CT)	Walker
McDade	Saxton	Weber
McEwen	Schaefer	Whitehurst
McKernan	Schuette	Whittaker
McKinney	Schulze	Wolf
McMillan	Sensenbrenner	Wortley
Miller (OH)	Shaw	Young (AK)
Miller (WA)	Shelby	Young (FL)
Mitchell	Shumway	Zschau
Molinar	Sikorski	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Dymally	Oberstar	Whitten
---------	----------	---------

## NOT VOTING—28

Bentley	Frenzel	Pepper
Courter	Goodling	Rudd
Crockett	Hartnett	Sabo
Dellums	Jones (NC)	Schneider
Derrick	Kolbe	Schroeder
DioGuardi	Kolter	Smith (NE)
English	Latta	Wise
Evans (IA)	Leach (IA)	Yates
Ford (MI)	Mikulski	
Franklin	Ortiz	

□ 1510

Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mrs. ROUKEMA changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to designate the week of September 8, 1985, as "National Independent Retail Grocer Week."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1239) entitled "An act making urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, for emergency famine relief and recovery in Africa, and for other purposes."

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

The message also announced that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 6, 8, 9, and 14 to the above-entitled bill.

□ 1520

# VOTING RECORD OF REPRESENTATIVE NATCHER

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, an important milestone in legislative history was reached yesterday.

Representative WILLIAM H. NATCHER of Bowling Green, KY, has never missed a day or rollcall vote since he has been a Member of Congress.

BILL NATCHER first took the oath of office on January 6, 1954. Since that time, he has cast 9,960 rollcall votes and answered 4,041 quorum calls, making a total of 14,001 rollcalls. Yesterday, on April 2, 1985, on rollcall No. 44, BILL NATCHER cast his 14,000th rollcall.

May his example of constancy and dedication be a light in the darkness of political negativism and a continuing inspiration to us all.

## PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE LAW AND GOVERNMENT RELATIONS OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Government Relations of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit today, Wednesday, April 3, 1985, while the House is considering amendments under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOAKLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only to inquire of the gentleman whether or not this has been cleared with the minority.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it has been cleared with the minority.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## STOP PROLIFERATION OF OFFICIAL RESIDENCES BEFORE IT STARTS

(Mr. PETRI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, evidently the search is on for an official residence for the Secretary of State, to be donated to the Government by some wealthy individual. I suppose there was some justification for an official residence for the Vice President, especially as it is located on Government property. But let us think twice before carrying this residence proliferation any further.

If the Secretary of State has a grand residence provided free of charge, can we deny this same perk to the Secretary of Defense? Surely he has equal importance and security concerns. And how about the Secretary of the Treasury? He'll want and deserve a lovely residence, too. And the Director of the CIA certainly has security problems as great as anyone's. But then, you can't have two distinct levels of the Cabinet—the haves and the have-nots. By and by, all major officials, and maybe the Speaker of the House, too, will hold forth like great lords in grand ducal palaces scattered about the city.

Mr. Speaker, this is a prospect totally inappropriate to a democracy. And don't think it is costless to the taxpayers either. The wealthy donors of these mansions are going to take charitable deductions based on inflated valuations, avoid capital gains taxes, and cost the rest of us a bundle in reduced revenues.

So before we create a new class of great princes and dukes in our midst, let's stop this residence proliferation before it starts.

## PRESIDENT OF COLOMBIA OPPOSES MILITARY INTERVENTION IN CENTRAL AMERICA

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, we were honored today by a visit from the President of Colombia, Belisario Betancur, who is one of the leaders of the Contadora group that is trying to bring about a political solution to the hostilities in Central America.

One thing that President Betancur said which will be of interest to all of us in this body is—and I quote—that "military intervention, from whatever source, will not put an end to the conflict in Central America. It will only masticize it."

Mr. Speaker, the same message was heard in this Chamber just a few weeks ago from President Alfonsín of Argentina. I hope Mr. Reagan gets the message in time to change his militaristic policy in Central America.

## THE MCINTYRE CONTROVERSY

(Mr. McCANDLESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address what surely has to be one of the most shameful chapters in the history of the House of Representatives. The refusal of this body to seat the duly elected, and State-certified winner of Indiana's Eighth Congressional District would be noteworthy in a totalitarian society. In a democracy such as ours, it is no less than unthinkable.

The facts of the case are clear. Rick McIntyre won the election by 34 votes. The recount increased Mr. McIntyre's lead to 418 votes. The recount was conducted by three people on each recount commission in 15 counties. In 9 of the 15 the commissions were made up of two Democrats and one Republican. Of the ballots that were disallowed in the recount, 96 percent of them came from counties controlled 2-1 by Democrats. No claims of fraud or irregular procedure have been made.

Meanwhile, through no fault of their own, 500,000 people in Indiana have no voice in the House of Representatives. This is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. McIntyre should be seated.

## NEWLY INTRODUCED BILL WOULD ADDRESS PROBLEM OF HAZARDOUS WASTE TREATMENT

(Mr. TORRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to encourage the construction of environmentally safe hazardous waste facilities.

My legislation does a number of things: It encourages businesses to reduce or treat the waste they generate. It encourages the safe transportation of hazardous waste. And it coordinates the work of the Federal agencies when they have to respond to an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, it is not enough to pass legislation, as we did last year, to phase out the use of landfills for hazardous waste disposal. We also need to encourage alternative disposal methods.

Similarly, it is not enough to pass Superfund legislation this year, as I hope we do. We also need to stop transporting waste—long distances and in poorly inspected trucks—from one leaking site to other landfills.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation hastens the day when all hazardous waste landfills can be closed, and treatment facilities can be built where the waste is generated. We cannot afford to wait much longer.

## IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENTIAL LINE ITEM VETO AUTHORITY

(Mr. GALLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1



minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support congressional approval of a constitutional amendment to give the President line item veto authority.

It is clear that reducing the Federal deficit must be a top priority of this Congress and the administration. This unreasonable Federal deficit holds the potential to destroy our economic recovery and threaten future economic viability. Our future must be built on a solid foundation of sound management and lean Government.

In order to bring the deficit under control, we must consider new ways to restrain spending. Raising taxes is simply not the answer. We should, instead, limit Federal spending by granting line item veto authority on appropriations bills to the President. With a Presidential line item veto, the U.S. Government would be held to the same standards as those of 43 of our States.

Many of these same States have also managed to balance their budgets. The power to restrain big spenders is one which has worked very well for the State of New Jersey and I believe would work equally well for the Federal Government.

Under present law, the President is reluctant to exercise his veto power because he has only the power to veto an entire appropriations bill which may cover spending for literally hundreds of programs, most of which are necessary and worthwhile. There are, however, those items that would not stand the test of individual votes. Granting the authority of line item veto to the President would provide our constituents with the needed assurance of the necessity of Federal expenditures.

I, therefore, call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 49, as introduced by my distinguished colleagues, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. HALL, and Mr. KEMP. House Joint Resolution 49 proposes a constitutional amendment to give the President line item veto authority on appropriations bills.

□ 1530

#### U.S. PRISONERS ALIVE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Mr. HENDON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HENDON. Mr. Speaker, Pvt. Robert Garwood, who returned to the United States from Vietnam in 1979, has made available to the Wall Street Journal and more recently to me information showing U.S. prisoners of war alive in Communist prisons in Southeast Asia in the late 1970's.

Lt. Gen. Eugene Tighe, former director of U.S. military intelligence, has

said publicly that Private Garwood's statements "don't sound unrealistic at all" and that some of Garwood's information coincides with data General Tighe saw while he was Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you and my colleagues a statement that I made to the press recently, and it is this: Some of the information Private Garwood has given to me is a virtual carbon copy of information our Government has, showing a large number of U.S. prisoners of war in captivity at a very specific location in Southeast Asia in August of 1982. The source of that 1982 report passed two Government administered lie-detector tests showing he was telling the truth.

To repeat, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, Private Garwood's information is a virtual carbon copy of that report.

Isn't it time, Mr. Speaker, to bring these brave men home?

#### ROTUNDA CEREMONY TO REMEMBER VICTIMS OF HOLOCAUST

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, last evening this House passed a resolution allowing for a rotunda ceremony to commemorate the victims of the Holocaust. This observance will be an important statement of our Nation's moral leadership.

We are the only Nation in the world besides Israel which has an annual observance in memory of the victims of the Holocaust. It serves as an expression of the commitment of the American people and their Government, and our recognition that only through remembrance and study of what happened and why can we prevent the heinous crime of genocide from occurring again.

Beyond this, however, the days of remembrance honor those who survived the horrors of the concentration camps and came to America to build new lives. These people are loyal and productive citizens of our Nation. They are active participants in the democratic process. Their contributions to the national heritage, culture, and economy have enriched us all. Their journey from survival in the death camps to great and productive lives in their new homes is a testament to the immense strength of the human spirit, and the capacity to do good that exists in all of us.

#### BOOSTING U.S. FOOTWEAR

(Mr. McKERNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McKERNAN. Mr. Speaker, since 1981, there has been a 50-percent increase in foreign shoes entering this Nation. Imports now account for more than 70 percent of U.S. sales.

In Maine, employment in the footwear industry has dropped by 27 percent since 1981. In the last year alone, 32 footwear manufacturers have closed their doors or have reduced their operations, resulting in a job loss of 4,200.

The International Trade Commission is holding a hearing later this month as part of its renewed investigation of how footwear imports have affected the domestic industry. And today, several of my colleagues in the congressional footwear caucus and I are introducing legislation that demonstrates our concern for the industry's future. The American Footwear Industry Recovery Act of 1985 would limit footwear imports for an 8-year period to about half of the U.S. market. This would ensure that domestic manufacturers in Maine and elsewhere have time to recover and compete on a fair basis with importers.

I urge my colleagues to support this very important legislation.

#### FEDERAL SUPPLEMENTAL COMPENSATION PROGRAM

(Mr. EDGAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we passed a temporary extension of the Federal supplemental compensation program which expired on March 31. I am pleased that this temporary extension was passed, but further action is still needed by the House.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, unemployment levels are still above the national average. The problem of long-term unemployment continues to grow worse. Throughout the State, especially for communities dependent on steel, coal, and textiles, recession and joblessness continue. Over the last several years in my own district, hundreds of workers have lost their jobs at Westinghouse's Lester plant; the plant will close down in 2 years.

Dramatic industrial and demographic changes will cause the number of discouraged and dislocated workers to increase even more in Pennsylvania and throughout the Nation.

The President has said he will veto an extension of FSC, there is great pressure to reduce the budget deficit, and that the Senate is reluctant to act. However, it is my view that the House of Representatives must take the lead in standing up for the workers and communities devastated by these economic forces.

I support the efforts of Congressmen PEASE, CLINGER, and others to

make long-term improvements in the Federal component of the unemployment compensation program to address this critical situation. I look forward to working with my colleagues toward this end.

#### IN NICARAGUA 114 MEMBERS OF OPPOSITION IMPRISONED IN ZONA FRANCA PRISON

(Mr. WEBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a very enlightening 4-day tour of El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Honduras, with our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. Speaker, while in Nicaragua, I was horrified to learn that the Sandinista government has imprisoned 114 members of the opposition Social Christian Party in the Zona Franca Prison near Sandina Airport. This information came to me not from Contra guerrillas, Mr. Speaker, but from three members of recognized opposition parties in the independent press in Managua.

Furthermore, I was informed that in an effort to force false concessions from these political prisoners, the Sandinistas have undertaken an incredible practice of threatening to imprison these political prisoners with deathly ill tuberculosis patients.

Furthermore, I learned that they have carried out this threat in certain circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, this gestapo-style tactic should fill all of us, regardless of our view on the Central American situation, with the utmost revulsion and I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in demanding that the Sandinista government end this incredible human rights abuse.

#### H.R. 700 IS NOT A CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, supporters of H.R. 700, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1985, will tell you they have the answer to the problems faced by minorities in America. They are wrong.

H.R. 700 is not a civil rights bill. A better name for it would be the Comprehensive Federal Intrusion Act. Under the aegis of civil rights, it extends the hands of the Federal Government into almost every aspect of our economy. Small business, small farms, ranches, and schools, would be burdened by intrusive and unnecessary regulations.

Today I am offering an alternative to H.R. 700, the Minority Opportunity

Restoration Act, which addresses the real problems faced by minorities. My bill offers enterprise zones to help rebuild inner cities, the youth opportunities and ways to help young people compete in the labor market, urban homesteading to improve families as well as neighborhoods, and education vouchers to allow the less privileged a chance to opt for a better education.

The Minority Opportunity Restoration Act will give minorities an opportunity to prosper and build for themselves, rather than remain under the oppressive hand of the Federal Government.

#### EXERCISE OF RIGHT TO EXPRESS POINTS OF VIEW

(Mr. STRANG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I rise with some sadness to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2 on page H1734 some remarks addressed to us by our majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. WRIGHT. It says, and I quote:

Today in 1 minute speeches Members of the Republican freshman class took practically an hour just to make speeches to sell their point of view.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the kind of leadership that I came here to get. We have a right to exercise our point of view under the rules of this House, and I am deeply disappointed.

#### MARXIST TYRANNY IN NICARAGUA

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER] just confirmed the lead article of this morning's Washington Times that that bastion of democracy and enlightened liberal thought, the Marxist government of Nicaragua, has just imprisoned 114 of its outspoken opponents.

So this was what that farce of an election in November was for. The Sandinista tyrants put on a happy face to the world, take a stab at professed pluralism, and use the election as an opportunity to uproot those who through peaceful means threaten the Sandinistas' grip on an innocent nation.

It is hard to see a silver lining in such an ominous cloud, but if there is one perhaps it is that the supporters of the Sandinistas here in Congress will find it a little harder to explain away these new acts of tyranny of the Marxist despots. And it is one more reason we should do all in our power to support the Nicaraguan freedom fighters.

#### ATA NAMES 1985 TRUCKDRIVER OF THE YEAR

(Mrs. BYRON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age when we hear nothing but so many problems and horror stories, I rise today to share with my colleagues a story of which I am very proud.

I have a constituent, John Howard Chamberlain, age 45, that has been honored today by the American Trucking Association as the driver of the year. Mr. Chamberlain, who resides in Westminster, MD, drives for the Giant Food Co. He has logged over 2 million miles of accident-free driving on our highways, and his aim is to increase that by a few more million miles to 3 million or 4 million miles.

I would just like to share with my colleagues this achievement of a fine, outstanding Marylander.

#### BEQUESTS FOR THE CHILDREN

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, people my age are the children of a very special generation of Americans, who led us out of the Great Depression, and to victory in World War II. For both of these great achievements, our leaders had to borrow. In so doing, they added \$200 billion to the national debt.

All our lives, we—their children—are having to pay interest on that debt. Until we began adding debt of our own, the total cost of our inherited debt was roughly \$7 billion per year. This was a small price to pay for the prosperity and freedom these achievements made possible.

Now we are the Nation's leaders. Under our stewardship, the national debt will grow by at least \$2 trillion—\$3 trillion, if we are not careful. All their lives, our children will have to pay interest on that debt. Every year, it will cost them roughly \$200 billion.

Adjusted for inflation, that's five times the debt burden our parents left us. And what great achievements did this buy, that will endure in our children's memories?

#### ODE TO VILLANOVA

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker—

I rise today  
To honor a team,  
The Villanova Wildcats,  
Who now reign supreme!  
They captured the prize  
Many others had sought.



A team of destiny;  
They were not to be caught.

Stars are they all,  
McLain and McClain, Jensen and Pressley.  
But the brightest star of all—the MVP—  
Is a guy from the Bronx named Ed Pinckney.

For the past four years  
He has anchored his team  
And we, from the Bronx, are proud,  
indeed,

That E-Z Ed has achieved his dream.

A word of praise

Must also go

To that fiery Italian,  
Coach Rollie Massimino.

The Wildcats were told  
It could not be done.

But the world was wrong;  
Villanova is Number One!

#### UNITED STATES-JAPAN TRADE IMBALANCE

(Mrs. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, some have termed Japan's recently announced intention to increase auto exports to the United States by 25 percent as "unfortunate," "poorly timed," and "a miscalculation."

Others consider it an outrageous act of arrogance and greed from a close ally whose economy we helped rebuild and whose security we share in maintaining.

Faced with a staggering \$123 billion trade deficit, nearly one-third of it with Japan, Americans are reevaluating our trade relationships and policies in search of answers.

The swift Japanese action to take advantage of expired auto quota agreements with the United States has highly charged the current trade talks on opening Japan's telecommunications market.

Their unabashed auto market-grab and intransigence in negotiations have taunted harsh retaliation against Japanese products in this country if U.S. demands for market access are not met.

Do Japanese trade officials really believe reducing the number of technical standards required for approval of telecommunications equipment from over 50 to 30 signifies an opening of their market?

Are the Japanese serious about opening their markets when their requirements involve fine points such as how many times a telephone may automatically redial a number?

Can we believe that allowing one Japanese citizen employed by a subsidiary of an American firm to sit on a telecommunications standards advisory committee will ensure U.S. access to Japan's domestic market?

Mr. Speaker, it is high time we wake up to the realities of the global marketplace instead of relying on protracted

negotiations, or for the dollar to fall.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to give teeth to our defensive Mixed Credits Program which we legislated nearly 2 years ago by funding it now. We should stop telling our competitors how aggressive we can be and start showing them.

#### U.S. ROUTE 22 BYPASS IN WEIRTON, WV

(Mr. MOLLOHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which is significant to the economy of the northern panhandle of the First Congressional District of West Virginia as well as the entire upper Ohio Valley.

My bill would designate the U.S. Route 22 bypass in Weirton, WV, as a Federal priority primary route.

This 2.7-mile, four-lane bypass will link the Weirton-Steubenville Bridge—now under construction—to an existing four-lane highway at Haller Park. Without the bypass, the new bridge is not nearly as effective. Together, the bridge and the bypass represent the solution to this heavily industrialized area's transportation needs.

The legislation I am introducing would increase the Federal share of funding for the U.S. Route 22 bypass from 75 percent to 95 percent and, thus, provide the State of West Virginia with a tremendous incentive to allocate its primary highway funds to this critical project.

I encourage your support for this local, regional, and national transportation priority.

□ 1550

#### THE REBIRTH OF NORTHEAST URBAN AREAS

(Mr. RITTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, now that the dust has settled over Villanova's spectacular NCAA championship victory, the American people can draw certain conclusions.

First and foremost is that basketball is back at its best in the East and Northeast U.S.A. And that is the way it was up to the early 1950's, during the days of a healthy urban America. Now we are seeing a rebirth of the Northeast urban areas.

From downtown Philadelphia, home of Villanova; to Washington, DC and Georgetown; to Brooklyn, NY, home of St. John's; to downtown Allentown, Bethlehem, and Easton in the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania, the home of emergent basketball power Lehigh

University, America's northeastern cities are on the move.

Mr. Speaker, Lehigh, the surprise victor in the ECC actually beat Georgetown in the opening round game of the NCAA tournament. That is, Lehigh beat Georgetown 32 to 29 in the second half of their historic game on March 13, 1985. The second half winning performance of Coach Tom Schneider's never-say-die engineers led by Mike Polaha and Daren Queenan reflects the Lehigh Valley's own urban comeback and is cause for pride in the achievements of Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District.

#### THE REAGAN ARMENIAN GENOCIDE POSITION

(Mr. LEHMAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, during the 98th Congress, the House unanimously passed a resolution commemorating the victims of the Armenian genocide.

Earlier this week, Congresswoman NANCY JOHNSON and I were joined by 24 other Members of this body in a bipartisan letter to the President asking that he discuss this issue in his talks with Turkey's Prime Minister.

Well, the President did discuss the Armenian Genocide with the Prime Minister.

However, rather than join the majority of House Members and the hundreds of thousands of Americans of Armenian ancestry who acknowledge the genocide as an historical fact, the President went on record as opposing our efforts to commemorate what is commonly known as the first genocide of the 20th century.

And while the President expressed his regret that the Turks and Armenians have not been able to resolve their differences, rather than offering to facilitate a resolution, the President has decided that commemorating the Genocide would, "harm relations with an important ally."

Mr. President, I remind you of your proclamation in 1981, "like the genocide of the Armenians before it—the lessons of the Holocaust must never be forgotten."

And Mr. President, I remind you of what better ally we have than the thousands of Armenians who have helped build this Nation.

#### LAWS ARE FOR EVERYONE

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, in all the furor over the majority ignoring precedent by denying Mr. McIntyre

his seat pending the outcome of the recount, we may have forgotten that there is only one contested election before the House.

It is not the McIntyre case, but the Second District of Idaho. In order to keep McCloskey alive, the task force on the McIntyre issue has adopted a novel approach. The House now apparently recounts according to rules it adopts after the election any race where it is dissatisfied with the result of a close election.

This is a very bad precedent. It ignores the function of the localities and of the States. It casts doubt on the laws governing the election of public officials and it opens a wedge for Federal control of the electoral process.

But in this one case, the evil of such an approach is even worse. The majority is applying a rule to its advantage in Indiana and refusing to apply that same rule in Idaho. If the Eighth District of Indiana deserves to be recounted yet again by House tellers, then the Second District of Idaho should be recounted. Idaho has never been recounted. Indiana has been recounted at least twice.

On what basis are new rules so selectively followed? Despite the protestations of the majority, there seems to be ample evidence that rules are adopted only on the basis of who is ahead and to what party he belongs. If the majority isn't going to seat McIntyre, it should at least look into unseating others on the same basis.

#### EXTENDING THE RIGHT TO VOTE FOR PRESIDENT TO THE U.S. TERRITORIES

(Mr. DE LUGO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that 123 Members of the House—Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, from the North, South, East, and West—have agreed to cosponsor House Joint Resolution 23, which would extend the right to vote for President to the U.S. territories of the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa and the Northern Marianas.

Over 123 of our colleagues agree geographic disenfranchisement of American citizens is patently unfair. Their support also shows that members of both parties take their party platforms seriously, since both the Democratic and the Republican platforms included planks advocating the Presidential vote for the territories.

This bipartisan demonstration of support is deeply appreciated by the people of the territories, and I urge our colleagues who have not yet signed up to join with the 123 members sponsoring this historic legisla-

tion which reaffirms the vitality of our American democracy.

#### THE WIC NUTRITION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1985

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, today I call the attention of my colleagues to legislation I have introduced to improve the effectiveness of the Federal Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children—the WIC Program—without any increase in budget outlays and at no cost to the Federal Government.

The WIC Nutrition Act of 1985 would bar States, counties, and municipalities from collecting sales tax on food purchased with WIC funds. At least 14 States and numerous local governments last year diverted over \$7.4 million Federal funds from this program into State treasuries, while also retaining 20 percent of the program grants to cover administrative costs. This diversion had the effect of denying participation in the program to at least 16,000 women, infants, and children nationwide.

In these days of budget constraint, we must do everything in our power to ensure that our scarce national resources are used as effectively as possible. Every dollar taxed by these 14 States is a dollar that is unavailable for the purchase of food.

I urge my colleagues to support the WIC Nutrition Improvement Act of 1985.

#### OBSERVATION OF RECENT ELECTIONS IN EL SALVADOR

(Mr. JONES of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, last weekend I had the privilege of leading a delegation of U.S. observers to El Salvador to view those elections. There were eight of us in the official delegation; from both political parties: two Members of Congress, six from the private sector.

On that election day Sunday, we dispersed to nearly 30 towns in El Salvador, had extensive conversations about and saw the conduct of the elections; came back, issued a communique on which we had unanimous agreement. That agreement was that those elections were free, they were fair, as judged by any standard including that which we would use in the United States.

We urged in that communique that all parties respect the outcome of those elections. The party of President Duarte scored a tremendous victory of

54 percent, and now we understand today that two of the parties who did not fare so well; the PCN and Arena, are protesting those elections and threatening to undermine the outcome of those elections.

□ 1600

I think it would be a tragedy for the seeds of democracy that have been planted in El Salvador if all parties did not adhere to and respect those elections. On behalf of all of the members of that U.S. observer delegation we again urge all parties in El Salvador to adhere to and respect those elections.

#### A COURAGEOUS LEADER

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, please let justice be done. Seat Rick McIntyre.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, confirming the observations of the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma who just spoke. I, too, was a special observer Sunday in El Salvador. It was a joy to see a dynamic democracy in action in that small country. Monday I was in the adjoining country of Honduras to see our bilateral agreements continuing to strengthen the friendship between our country and that beautiful little Central American republic.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like briefly to speak today about Nicaragua and one of its native sons who is one of the most courageous leaders and defender of liberty that we have anywhere throughout North America.

Mr. Speaker, this hero that I speak of is your kind of man. Like you, he rose from humble beginnings to a leader in his country. I am speaking about the Archbishop of Nicaragua Obando y Bravo. When our colleague, VIN WEBER, and I flew into Managua Saturday we were prepared to meet a man of great faith, but we were not prepared for the tower of strength and courage that warmly welcomed us into his home. Mr. WEBER and I knew within minutes of meeting Archbishop Obando y Bravo why all freedom loving Nicaraguans call him the greatest man in their country.

We met with the archbishop for over an hour, and he confirmed our worst fears about the direction of his beloved country.

He is a man for all seasons, and this dark winter that Nicaragua is suffering requires men and women of this dedication. I would like to pass on to the House some startling facts about loyalty and disloyalty in the Catholic clergy of Nicaragua. These facts were first presented to us by our Embassy and the archbishop confirmed them. There are only 912 Catholic clergy in



that small country—that includes all priests, nuns, monks, both foreign and Nicaraguan citizens. This is a fairly low ratio of cleric to laypersons, less than one priest per 3,000 people.

Now please analyze the following: 860 of the priests and nuns in Nicaragua are loyal to Archbishop Obando y Bravo and his eight bishops; 860! That leaves only 52 who have joined the pro-Communist popular church, the phoney euphemism for a Communist-puppet, state controlled religion. And get this fact—only 10 of that disloyal band of 52 are Nicaraguans—only 10.

Mr. Speaker, isn't it about time this body recognizes that the handful of naive nuns, priests, ministers, women groups and students who go down to Nicaragua to get the deluxe, quicky liberation theology tour are being sold a pro-Communist bill of goods. What they are shown on the 'Potemkin' Sandinista tour is not the ugly reality of anti-Christian antiliberty Nicaragua, but just a Fantasy Island tour of lies and illusion.

Archbishop Obando y Bravo told Vin and I that not one of the nine commandantes has been seen in a church in years. Nor has suspended priest Miguel d'Escoto, the token Foreign Minister, ever been seen inside a church in Nicaragua. Has even one of "the revolutionary tourists" returned home to tell the truth about these anti-Christian Leninists and their contempt for religion. Can't you just imagine d'Escoto yelling to Danny Ortega, at the sight of every flight bringing to Managua the next load of naive clerics begging to be brain-washed, "Boss, de plane, de plane! It's Fantasy Island time!"

#### FREEZE THE BUDGET OF NASA

(Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, later today the House will be considering the 1986 authorization of NASA, H.R. 1714.

I plan to offer an amendment to that authorization to implement a concept that many are talking about but few are putting forward as reality, and that is a budget freeze.

H.R. 1714 is being presented to us with a 5-percent increase over the amount appropriated for this budget year. That is almost \$400 million. This is the first 1986 authorization to come before us, and I think it is time we implement the freeze concept as a means of controlling spending and getting the budget deficit under control.

I hope all those who believe that we must make a start on solving the budget deficit will support my amendment and freeze the budget of NASA as we will have to freeze and even cut

the budgets of many agencies that come before us.

#### FAIR RETIREMENT ACT OF 1985

(Mr. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I introduced the Fair Retirement Act of 1985 to extend full individual retirement account eligibility to spouses who choose to work in the home and to maintain the relative value of IRA rights over time by indexing the tax-free annual contribution limit to inflation.

The existing limitations on IRA contributions for married couples with one wage-earning spouse are inequitable.

At the end of 1984, IRA assets in this country totaled \$132 billion. This amount of long-term investment capital, made available through IRA's, has helped fuel economic growth in this decade. Without indexing, however, IRA's will in effect be phased out slowly, as inflation erodes the value of the annual IRA contribution.

Congress must act now to eliminate the inequity in current law and grant non-wage-earning spouses the same IRA rights as wage-earning spouses and to ensure that the individual retirement account remains an attractive and valuable investment for retirement.

#### NO WHITE HATS IN NICARAGUA

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, no one wears white hats in Nicaragua. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER] mentioned the incarceration of several political prisoners in Managua by the Sandinistas. I am sure he is correct. On a recent visit to Nicaragua, I observed many similar violations of human rights, persecution of the church and lack of freedom of the press and travel. I am also concerned about the Sandinistas program to relocate thousands of peasants, uprooting them from their homes. In fact, there are many incidents that suggest to me that Daniel Ortega is not a friend of democracy; that he is primarily a man that loves power and that he is doing very little to democratize his country.

That does not mean that our policy of aiding the Contras is right. The Contras too appear to be violators of human rights and commit atrocities like the Sandinistas. But the point is, if we are going to speak out against human rights abuses on the right, we should do so on the left too. And Daniel Ortega and the Sandinistas are at the bottom of the barrel when it

comes to those nations that should be proud of their democratic traditions. Those original goals of the Sandinista revolution are becoming ancient relics.

#### SEAT RICHARD MCINTYRE IMMEDIATELY

(Mr. LENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret the circumstances which bring me here today. However, I speak before my colleagues on behalf of the voters of Indiana's Eighth Congressional District and in the interests of preserving our American system of democratic government.

The citizens of Indiana's Eighth have been unfairly robbed of representation in the House of Representatives since January 3. In a blatant abuse of political power, the democratic-controlled House has refused to seat Congressman-elect Richard McIntyre, a Republican, and the certified winner in this particular election contest.

Displaying a cavalier disregard for the law and the will of the electorate, House Democrats have taken matters into their own hands to alter the outcome of this election. They have chosen to conduct a selective recount in the hope of swinging the results in favor of their colleague, Democrat Frank McCloskey.

Such unprecedented actions make a mockery and a sham of the democratic process in America. The only wrongdoing evidenced throughout this entire disgraceful episode in American history has been perpetrated by the House Democrats!

The American system of government is the envy of the world. Yet, I see a dangerous threat to democracy when a political party can steal power away from the voters in determining representation in Congress. The voters of Indiana's Eighth District elected Richard McIntyre to represent them in Congress. Let us seize the opportunity to preserve and protect their rights—and the rights of all American citizens—and seat Richard McIntyre immediately!

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1714, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1986

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 119 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 119

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may,

pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1714) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control and data communications, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections, and each title shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CROCKETT). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 119 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1714, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization for fiscal year 1986. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology. It further provides that the bill shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections and that each title shall be considered as read. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1714 authorizes \$7.9 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA] in fiscal year 1986. This overall funding level is equal to the amount requested by the administration and is approximately \$375 million above the fiscal year 1985 funding level.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple, open rule which will allow full consideration of this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

□ 1610

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 119 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1714 which authorizes appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1986. The rule provides for consideration of the bill in the Committee of the

Whole, with 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Science and Technology Committee.

Following general debate the bill will be read by title instead of by section for amendment under the 5-minute rule, and any germane amendments will be in order for consideration. So this is a completely open rule. Finally, the rule provides for the usual motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1714 authorizes approximately \$7.9 billion for NASA in fiscal year 1986 for a variety of purposes including research and development, space flight, control and data communications, construction of facilities, and research and program management.

The total authorization is identical to the amount requested by the administration, although the committee has allocated the funds somewhat differently than requested. The total authorization is 5 percent over the fiscal 1985 authorization, meaning real growth for the agency is about six-tenths of 1 percent. I think the committee is to be commended on holding down spending for NASA while at the same time upholding its important missions and needs.

Mr. Speaker, this authorization will permit NASA to move forward on such ongoing programs as the space shuttle, space telescope, the Galileo mission, and the gamma ray observatory and shuttle/spacelab payload experiments.

Mr. Speaker, title II of this bill establishes a space shuttle pricing policy for fiscal years 1989-91 that is not without controversy, judging from the additional views in the committee report. Some of the members of the committee think the pricing policy will undermine efforts by the private sector to make outerspace a commercially viable venture. Nevertheless, the bill was reported by voice vote, and the Members who have an alternative pricing system will be able under this rule to offer their amendments. This rule was also adopted by voice vote, without controversy. I therefore urge its adoption so that we can proceed with the consideration of the NASA authorization.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE].

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR  
OF H.R. 1401, H.R. 1402, H.R. 1403

Mr. ROSE. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. SPEAKER, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from the bills, H.R. 1401, 1402, and 1403.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I urge the adoption of the resolution, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 1714, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1986

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 119 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1714.

□ 1615

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1714, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control and data communications, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes, with Mr. TORRES in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA].

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1714, which would authorize fiscal year 1986 funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I want to congratulate Mr. NELSON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications, and



Mr. GLICKMAN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Aviation and Materials for their leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor. They have done an outstanding job in perfecting this legislation. I also want to acknowledge the efforts of Mr. LUJAN, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. LEWIS on the other side of the aisle.

The success of the Space Shuttle Program continues to renew our Nation's confidence in American greatness and to demonstrate to the world that we are again first in space. But, we cannot rest on our laurels because the competition in international space activities is increasing at a rapid rate. Our space program plays a positive role in exerting world leadership in political, economic, and scientific knowledge which we must exploit to advantage.

NASA's activities are designed to maintain U.S. leadership in aeronautical and space research and technology and its utilization. More specifically, the objectives of NASA's activities are to: make the space transportation system fully operational and cost effective; move forward toward the establishment of a permanently manned space station; conduct an effective and productive program of aeronautical research and technology which will contribute to the enduring preeminence of the United States in aviation; conduct an effective and productive Space and Earth Sciences Program which expands human knowledge of the Earth, its environment, the solar system and the universe; conduct effective and productive space applications and technology programs which contribute materially to our Nation's current and future leadership in space; and enhance opportunities for U.S. private sector involvement in civil space and space-related activities.

The NASA fiscal year 1986 budget authorization provides for a deliberately paced program of flight projects and ground-based activities to make progress toward these objectives.

The NASA fiscal year 1986 budget request includes funding for ongoing programs such as the space shuttle, the space telescope, the Galileo mission, the Gamma Ray Observatory, shuttle/spacelab payload experiments, a Venus radar mapper mission, and the numerical aerodynamic simulation project.

Funding is provided to continue three new initiatives introduced last year including the upper atmospheric research satellite mission, the Mars geoscience/climatology orbiter mission, as well as a scatterometer instrument for the Navy remote ocean sensing system. The NASA fiscal year 1986 request also includes funding for continuing systems definition studies and advanced technical development activities for a permanent manned space station.

Finally, the budget request includes funding for two new initiatives: the Office of Commercial Programs and the orbital maneuvering vehicle.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the recommendations our committee has made with respect to the NASA budget request. The bill before you would authorize \$7,886 million for the agency which is the same amount as the request.

The major thrusts of the budget changes recommended by the committee are the following: Augment the shuttle orbiter structural spares to retain critical skills thereby maintaining production readiness for a fifth orbiter vehicle; and augment the space science and applications supporting research and technology activities for advanced technical development activities which should serve to reduce the technical and schedule risk of future flight program.

Reallocation of \$10 million in aeronautical research and technology activities for higher priority activities. I understand that some of this reallocation has been reconsidered and will be clarified and documented in a colloquy between Mr. GLICKMAN and Mr. LEWIS.

The committee added a number of language provisions including title II which would establish policy guidelines for establishing the space shuttle pricing policy for commercial and foreign users for the period fiscal year 1989-91.

I am including in the RECORD a comparison of the NASA fiscal year 1985 operating plan, the NASA fiscal year 1986 budget request and the committee action on the fiscal year 1986 budget.

I urge the support of my colleagues for H.R. 1714.

Space Program elements in fiscal year 1986 involve:

Definition and technology effort in preparation for development of a permanently manned space station, the next major step in exploration and utilization of space and a key element in continued U.S. leadership in space. The ability to function routinely in space onboard the space station will provide countless opportunities for experimenting in the known sciences as well as in those still to be discovered. Commercial companies, other U.S. Government agencies, and foreign governments have been invited to join us in this endeavor broadening the horizons for all those who participate. Definition and preliminary design contracts will be indicated in fiscal year 1985 so that the best ideas and technology of industry are considered before the final design and development are begun.

Expanded use of the space shuttle and other elements of the space transportation system capitalizing on its demonstrated capabilities to place satellites in orbit, to retrieve and repair

satellites, and to conduct experiments and make observations using the shuttle and the spacelab. The fiscal year 1986 program will provide for the procurement of the hardware, mission integration and training, ground processing and flight operations of the space shuttle. Flights during 1986 include payloads for NASA, Department of Defense and domestic commercial and international users of space. The present fleet of three orbiters will be expanded with the delivery of the fourth orbiter in mid-1985, and final operational modifications to OV-102 will be completed during 1985. Additional spacelab flights will capitalize on the success of the initial mission as this unique capability is exploited for space research and applications missions. The Centaur upper stages for Department of Defense and NASA missions will proceed toward the critical first uses of the planetary version in 1986 for the Galileo and Ulysses Missions. The initial launch from the Vandenberg launchsite scheduled for early 1986 will use the first set of lighter weight filament wound cases for the solid rocket booster. Work will continue on the space shuttle main engine to improve the operating margins, reliability and maintainability of the present configuration. Development efforts will be initiated on a re-useable orbital maneuvering vehicle to extend operational on-orbit capabilities beyond the range of the orbiter.

A banner year for the Space Science and Applications Program including the planned launch of the Galileo and Ulysses—formerly the International Solar Polar Mission—missions and the Hubble space telescope, the observations of Halley's Comet from Astro telescopes aboard the space shuttle, and the Voyager encounter with Uranus. The Galileo Mission will retain an option to fly by the asteroid Amphitrite on its way to Jupiter where it will send a probe into Jupiter's atmosphere and conduct a series of encounters with satellites of the giant planet. Ulysses will fly past Jupiter and use the powerful gravitational force of the planet to accelerate the spacecraft into a trajectory which will permit observation of the Sun at high latitudes previously beyond our capability to observe. The Hubble space telescope will provide a quantum jump over the best ground-based telescopes in our ability to observe and better understand the universe. Work will continue on important missions for the future: the Gamma Ray Observatory will study extremely high energy phenomena; the Venus radar mapping mission will penetrate the dense cloud cover and provide global imagery of the surface of Venus; the upper atmosphere research satellite will provide important information on the chemical composition and vulnerability of

the upper atmosphere; the Mars orbiter will provide geoscience and climatology mapping of Mars; the advanced communications technology satellite will demonstrate new capabilities in frequency reuse and onboard switching; and the scatterometer will fly on a Navy satellite to acquire global ocean data. Progress will continue in other areas including materials processing in space, the search and rescue locator system and analysis of data acquired from the Earth radiation budget satellite launched in late 1984.

Space research and technology activities to advance the technology base which provides new concepts, materials, components, devices, software and subsystems for use in U.S. civil and military space activities. This research emphasizes the longer range aspects of generic research and technology development in transportation, spacecraft and platform systems which are crucial to future U.S. leadership in space.

The aeronautical research and technology program contributes materially to the enduring preeminence of U.S. civil and military aviation by: First, conducting disciplinary and systems research at the leading edge of technology in those areas critical to the continued superiority of U.S. aircraft; second, maintaining the research centers in positions of excellence in facilities and technical staff; third, assuring timely transfer of research results to the U.S. aeronautical industry; fourth, assuring appropriate involvement of universities and industry; and fifth, providing aeronautical development support to other government agencies and U.S. industry. Conducted well in advance of and independent of specific applications, the aeronautical research and technology program includes both fundamental research in the aeronautical disciplines and systems research applicable to general classes of advanced military and civil aircraft. The program involves participation by aeronautical manufacturers to ensure that the technology is compatible with practical design considerations and can be successfully transferred into application in new and better aircraft, systems and components.

Mr. Chairman, I want to further discuss two program areas: the space shuttle and the space station.

#### SPACE SHUTTLE

There are many reasons why the space shuttle is an important and logical step in manned space flight and the U.S. space program:

First, the shuttle is our only manned space activity.

Man has worked hard to achieve—and has indeed achieved—the freedom of mobility on land, the freedom of sailing on his oceans, and the freedom of flying in the atmosphere. And he has discovered that he can also have the freedom of space. Man has learned

to fly in space, and man will continue to fly in space.

Given this fact, the United States cannot forgo its responsibility—to itself and to the free world—to have a part in manned space flight. And the space shuttle is clearly the most meaningful and useful manned space program for the coming decade.

Second, the space shuttle is needed to make space operations less complex and less costly.

Today we have to mount an enormous effort every time we launch an expendable space vehicle. The reusable space shuttle gives us a way to avoid this. This airplane-like spacecraft makes a launch into orbit an almost routine event at a cost much less than the expendable launch vehicles. This is possible by not throwing everything away after we have used it just once—just as we don't throw away an airplane after its first trip from Washington to Los Angeles.

The shuttle also allows for less cost to payload development. A satellite that will be launched in the shuttle will no longer have the environmental, structural, weight, and other associated constraints as those launched on an ELV. If an anomaly should occur to the satellite, the shuttle makes it possible to retrieve or repair, eliminating the need to throw away a costly satellite.

Fourth, the shuttle will encourage far greater international participation in space flight.

Since the initiation of the development of the Shuttle Program many European nations have been participating in a joint program to develop the spacelab. The Spacelab Program is a cooperative effort between NASA and the European Space Agency [ESA]. ESA is designing and developing the flight hardware. The spacelab will initiate a new era for space experimentation. Considerable international utilization of the shuttle/spacelab capability is now underway and future activity is being planned. In their long-range planning, other nations see the transition from the demonstration phase to the operational and commercial application aspects of space exploitation. Within this framework, the trend is toward greater flexibility, larger instruments and instrument groupings, and longer mission durations. The capabilities of the shuttle/spacelab offer new opportunities in the exploration and use of space.

The globally televised launch and return of the first five flights of *Columbia* and the first flight of *Challenger* calls to mind the proven significance of the Space Program in the arena of international relations and understanding and, thus, in the preservation of world peace. Because of the magnitude and ambitious character of NASA's Space Program, the United States can look back on a long

and fruitful history at collaboration with European and other nations. Future opportunities for international cooperation will greatly exceed past joint activities because of the Space Shuttle Program.

The initiation of routine space transportation operations in late 1982 marked the culmination of about 20 years of planning, designing, and development of a reliable, readily accessible and economically superior method to operate in space, for the purpose of expanding Earth-bound man's control over his destiny as an inhabitant of the only known life-supporting body in the solar system.

The space shuttle and NASA's future planning toward human permanence in space is the main element of NASA's conformance to the Space Act of 1958. As we move into the 1980's and prepare to respond to new challenges that will face us, we should review these policies and plan for the future, particularly with a view toward technology-driven projects that will help to provide the United States with the leadership in technology and its applications that is mandated by the Space Act.

One of these new challenges that appears as an important issue when considering the international aspects of the space shuttle is the challenge of international competition in space.

After overcoming the Soviet Union's initial lead in space in the early 1960's, the United States has generally maintained overall leadership in exploiting the various advantages that space offers. More recently, however, the United States has begun to lag the U.S.S.R. in some areas, such as long-duration manned orbital flight with its opportunities for extensive experimental and empirical data in such areas as life sciences, materials processing, assembly and repair, manned observations, and command and control. Other countries are becoming increasingly competitive. In particular, the current vigor of Soviet manned space program activity indicates continued expansion of capabilities and an increase in military space operations. During calendar year 1981 and 1982 the U.S.S.R. launched six manned flights including a 211-day space station mission completed on December 10, 1982, the longest in history and more than double the length of the longest U.S. mission to date—*Skylab-3*, 84 days. On April 20, 1983, the Soviets launched a new mission involving a three manned crew to the *Salyut-7*/Cosmos 1443 orbiting craft for another long duration mission.

Increasing competition to U.S. operations in space can also be expected from the European Economic Community which, through the European Space Agency [ESA], is developing its own space transportation system, the



expendable Ariane. Ariane, designed to compete with the U.S. shuttle and already drawing customers from it, will be able to launch Atlas-class payloads to geosynchronous transfer orbit—1,700 kg—while follow-on versions in development or planning have capabilities beyond that—up to 2,420 kg. Even a fully reusable crew and supply transport vehicle, the Hermes, is being studied for a two-stage version of Ariane V. In Japan, orbital capability will be provided by the Japanese-developed "N" launch vehicle, also to compete with the United States in the provision of launch services to geosynchronous orbit.

On the other hand, the emerging user community for the space shuttle includes numerous foreign countries whose initial response to the Shuttle Program's offer of launch services has been excellent. International involvement has been an important feature of the Space Shuttle Program since its inception. Nine member countries of ESA—Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom—entered into an agreement in September 1973 with the United States to undertake, as an ESA special project funded entirely in Europe—possibly in excess of \$800 million—to design, develop, manufacture, and deliver to NASA a space laboratory, called spacelab, for use with the shuttle. Austria, an ESA observer, is also contributing to the spacelab development.

Also, the National Research Council of Canada [NRCC] undertook in June 1975 to design, develop, and manufacture a space shuttle-attached remote manipulator system [RMS] at Canadian expense. The RMS will deploy payloads from the shuttle cargo bay, retrieve them, and perform certain payload servicing operations in space, all under remote control from the orbiter flight deck.

In summary, while previous international undertakings in space have amply demonstrated that the life styles and general well-being of mankind can be enhanced by reaching out beyond the Earth's atmosphere to exploit the unique properties of space, the space shuttle is the first significant quantum leap with the potential to make those operations a routine international activity. With its introduction, the United States, thus, is offering the services of a new, unique and highly useful transportation system to the world, comparable in its significance to the railroad some 100 years ago and the DC-3 aircraft 46 years ago.

#### SPACE STATION

Last year, in his State of the Union Message to Congress, President Reagan outlined a bold new initiative for the United States that will maintain and ensure, during the decade of

the 1990's and beyond, our hard won position of leadership in space. The President's initiative is a permanently manned space station to be in operation within a decade. As a fundamental element of his vision for this Nation's future, the space station will:

Reflect and contribute to America's commitment to research, technology, and productivity;

Be a peaceful, visible demonstration of U.S. strength and commitment to leadership;

Implement the clear direction the Civil Space Program has needed and found in the President's national space policy set forth in July 1982.

The time for space station is ripe—the agenda for tasks which can be undertaken and enhanced using the unique capabilities of the space station is full, and both U.S. industry and the NASA institution are fully prepared to implement the President's initiative. The station is, I believe, the next logical step in space.

To maximize the unique advantages provided by the environment of space, we need to establish a permanent presence that enables us to work in space full time and fully utilizes the capabilities of the space shuttle. Without the capability of the shuttle, it would be impossible to establish the more permanent presence in space referenced by the President on July 4, 1982, in his national space policy statement. A second reason is that the operations we have conducted with the shuttle have stimulated great interest in the private sector to look toward investments in future space activities. The construction of a space station is necessary to create the facilities that will greatly encourage such investment, and to stimulate new technology that will spinoff into the U.S. economy. Finally, the shuttle has also stimulated great international interest in the U.S. space program, as evidenced by the overwhelming reception of the Enterprise in Europe last summer and the recent highly successful flight of the spacelab. NASA is planning the Space Station Program in such a way that it will be possible for our friends and allies around the world to participate with us in taking this major step.

Based upon NASA and industry analyses over the past 18 months, the Space Station Program will serve a number of functions, such as:

A laboratory in space, for the conduct of science and the development of new technologies;

A permanent observatory, to look down upon the Earth and out at the universe;

A transportation node where payloads and vehicles are stationed, processed, and propelled to their destinations;

A servicing facility where payloads and vehicles are maintained, and if necessary, repaired;

An assembly facility where, due to ample time on orbit and the presence of appropriate equipment, large structures are put together and checked out;

A manufacturing facility where human intelligence and the servicing capability of the station combine to enhance commercial opportunities in space;

A storage depot where payloads and parts are kept on orbit for subsequent deployment; and

A staging base for more ambitious future missions.

The space station will represent a fundamentally new and versatile capability to support activities in space in the decade of the 1990's and beyond.

NASA is requesting \$230 million for the Space Station Program. An extensive definition effort is planned with sufficient resources to assure that the program, when hardware development is initiated, will be thoroughly defined, responsive to user requirements, and based on the proper mix of man and machine, incorporating the most advanced technology available.

This detailed engineering definition effort will provide the basis for commitment to the final design for the construction of the space station.

#### SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTIONS

The following table 1 summarizes the budget action taken by the Committee on Science and Technology on the fiscal year 1986 NASA budget request at the full committee markup on March 27, 1985.

TABLE 1  
(In millions of dollars)

Program	Fiscal year 1985 operating plan	Fiscal year 1986 budget request	Committee action
<b>RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT</b>			
1(a)(1) Space Station.....	150.0	230.0	230.0
1(a)(2) Space Trans. Cap. Dev.....	351.4	459.3	444.3
1(a)(3) Physics and Astronomy.....	677.2	630.4	637.4
1(a)(4) Life Sciences.....	62.3	72.0	72.0
1(a)(5) Planetary Exploration.....	290.9	359.0	359.0
1(a)(6) Space Applications.....	374.1	551.8	550.8
1(a)(7) Technology Utilization.....	9.5	11.1	11.1
1(a)(8) Commercial Use of Space.....	(8.5)	30.0	20.0
1(a)(9) Aeronautical Res. and Tech.....	342.4	354.0	354.0
1(a)(10) Space Research and Tech.....	150.0	168.0	168.0
1(a)(11) Tracking and Data Adv. Sys.....	14.8	16.2	16.2
Total: Research and Dev.....	2,422.6	2,881.8	2,862.8
<b>SPACE FLIGHT, CONTROL AND DATA COM.</b>			
1(b)(1) Space Shuttle Prod./Oper. Cap.....	1,492.1	976.5	1,011.5
1(b)(2) Space Transportation Oper.....	1,314.0	1,725.1	1,715.1
1(b)(3) Space/Ground Net. Com. and Data Sys.....	795.7	808.3	803.3
Total: Space Flight Control and Data Com.....	3,601.8	3,509.9	3,529.9
1(c) Construction of Facilities.....	150.0	149.3	148.3
1(d) Research and program mgt.....	1,336.3	1,345.0	1,345.0
Total: NASA.....	7,510.7	7,886.0	7,886.0

Again, I urge the support of my colleagues for H.R. 1714.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1714, the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1985. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications, Mr. NELSON, as well as the ranking minority member, Mr. WALKER, for the fine bill they brought to the full committee. Likewise, I also want to congratulate our chairman, Mr. FUQUA, for the bill he has brought to the floor.

By any standard, this bill is a good bill. It provides fair and balanced funding levels for NASA's programs and moves us ahead in some very important policy areas.

In view of the strong concern about the deficit and the critical need for a balanced budget, this piece of legislation shows a fine sense of fiscal responsibility on the part of many of us: Our chairman, Mr. FUQUA, and by Mr. NELSON and Mr. WALKER, as well as the other members of the committee. In addition to using our congressional responsibility to clarify priorities within the NASA budget, we have also managed to keep the total dollars at the same level as the President's request. This is an accomplishment of which all of us can be proud.

I am especially pleased that this bill recognizes that we have crossed the threshold of a new age in space science and applications. The programs supported in this budget will revolutionize many areas of science over the next decade. The programs in this budget will lead to the commercialization of many new space-based industries. By the year 2000, we may see space factories engaged in materials processing, turning out new drugs and products for the benefit of all mankind.

This budget provides the necessary infrastructure to support these activities, especially the space station, the space shuttle, and the orbital maneuvering vehicle. The space station is a vital part of our Nation's investment in science and technology. The quality of our progress in science and technology will affect the competitive strength of our industries and have a strong impact on jobs. If we move ahead rapidly, we will create more jobs and have a stronger industrial base. If we drag our feet—if we don't push back the frontiers of new technology—we will limit our ability to compete in the industrial marketplace in the years ahead. The space station will act as a hard driver of technology and strengthen our technology base in the years ahead.

While this budget is a balanced one, there are also some very controversial issues remaining in this bill. At both the subcommittee level and the full committee level, one of the major concerns was the issue of shuttle pricing policy.

The question of shuttle pricing policy was hotly debated during the

markups of both bills and I expect that it will be hotly debated today on the floor. During consideration of various amendments proposed in both the subcommittee and the full committee, it was clear that this debate was not a partisan one. In committee, the votes were close and I expect they will be close again.

Resolution of the issue of shuttle pricing policy will have a major impact on the future of space commercialization. The shuttle pricing policy issue is, first and foremost, a policy issue. Although the debate revolves specifically around prices that we will charge commercial and foreign customers for a launch on the shuttle, the issue is really one of policy. Once we have set the policy, all pricing decisions come easily. My primary concern is that we have not yet made the policy decision on the appropriate use of the national resource of the space shuttle. The fact is that resolution of the shuttle pricing issue will set a precedent on the relative role of government and of industry in the future use of space. Resolution of this issue will also have an impact on the budget of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

For these reasons, the debate on this bill is important. I urge my colleagues to participate fully in this debate.

□ 1620

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN].

Mr. GLICKMAN. I thank the chairman of my committee for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Transportation, Aviation and Materials conducted numerous field inspections and held extensive hearings here in Washington on the aeronautical part of the fiscal year 1986 NASA authorization. Testimony was taken from a variety of witnesses, both inside and outside of NASA.

Members of the subcommittee worked long and hard in carefully reviewing the NASA aeronautical program and the 1986 budget request. We found that although the dollar amount for aeronautical R&D is small—\$354 million recommended by the committee this year—the payoff is very large. This is true because NASA emphasizes the high-risk, long-term research and technology that industry is financially unable or unwilling to undertake. Such efforts provide the foundation for future aircraft and engines which return many times their initial cost to our economy. In this sense, NASA's aeronautical R&D is an investment in the truest meaning of the term.

For example, in 1983, export sales of aerospace products, the bulk of which were civil aircraft, exceeded \$16 billion. Imports were estimated to be \$3.4

billion. The resulting \$12.6 billion net positive contribution to our balance of trade was the largest of any U.S. manufacturing industry.

However you look at it, aviation is one of the real winners that this country still has, and NASA's aeronautics program helps to maintain that.

U.S. suppliers have built nearly 90 percent of the free world's civil air fleet by dollar value. Our airlines are our best ambassadors, offering superior quality, safety, comfort, and reliability, at economical costs. They speak well of America—to operator and user alike.

Of course, these results did not just happen. They came because we have consistently had the best products. And one of the big reasons for that has been the long-standing partnership between government and industry in developing new aeronautical technology.

Because of this, the Committee on Science and Technology has repeatedly urged the administration and the Congress to increase the resources devoted to aeronautical R&D. We have pointed to the many long-term benefits of such investment, which are reflected in billions of dollars in sales of U.S. aircraft both here and abroad, and in millions of jobs for Americans.

Yet, in spite of its proven cost benefits, the NASA aeronautics program has not kept pace with inflation nor with the relentless pressure from our competitors, both military and commercial. For example, the administration's request for fiscal year 1986 is only 15 percent greater than the actual amount spent in fiscal year 1980. If inflation is considered, the request for 1986 is 16 percent less than the purchasing power of the 1980 budget. There aren't many government programs that can make that claim.

Furthermore, anyone familiar with the dramatic increases in both the cost and complexity of new technology in the last few years knows that a level budget won't produce the same results as it once did. It simply costs more today to achieve each increment of improvement in fuel efficiency or safety or performance.

Of course, none of this would cause alarm if the Europeans, Japanese, and the South Americans had not begun to pose a serious competitive threat. But they have.

In fact, within the last year, the European Airbus consortium announced a launch of its all-new 150-passenger commercial airliner, the A-320. This puts them ahead of any of our aircraft companies who are still in the planning phase.

Because of this, I believe, the committee's recommendation is at the low end of what is actually needed. In my view, international conditions call for



expanding NASA's aeronautical program, not curtailing it.

The administration, for its part, is moving slowly in this direction. But such was not always the case. Initially it went all out to change NASA's basic method of doing business. It sought to break up the long-standing partnership between the Government and industry that was largely responsible for our preeminence in aeronautics.

Since, then, of course, the Congress has spoken clearly to reject this misguided idea. Also, the Office of Science and Technology Policy was "born again" and, in a very comprehensive study, reaffirmed the importance of NASA's work to both national security and economic well-being.

The fiscal year 1986 budget reflects this more responsible attitude. It shows a growth of 3.5 percent over last year—still far short of what is needed, even to stay even with inflation, but about the best we can hope for in a difficult budget climate.

For this reason, the committee recommended approval of the aggregate amount requested by NASA with only some minor realignment of programs within the aeronautical research and technology line item.

Mr. Chairman, in my statement I will have more information regarding the specifics of the NASA aeronautics program, but we have decided to recommend some changes from what our committee report has in there in connection with some priorities in that, and, in this connection, I would be glad to yield to my ranking member, a friend with whom I have been pleased to work, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage my colleague from Kansas in a colloquy regarding the recommended allocation of funds within the line item in the bill called aeronautical research and technology. In particular, I would ask him to explain and clarify his views on recommended changes in this area since the full Science and Technology Committee considered this bill last week.

Mr. GLICKMAN. As agreed during the full committee markup of this bill last week, I, along with other Members concerned with the NASA aeronautics program, met to reconsider the report language approved by the full committee containing specific guidance with regard to the aeronautical programs of NASA. As a result of those meetings, I am recommending the following revised guidance:

First, NASA should proceed with planning for the altitude wind tunnel at the Lewis Research Center, but should cap its expenditures in fiscal year 1986 at \$3.5 million and should seek ways to overcome the limitations on capability identified by the Con-

gressional Advisory Committee on Aeronautics.

Second, NASA should proceed with the oblique wing flight test at a level of \$3.7 million in fiscal year 1986. The reduction of \$1 million from the request is intended to encourage NASA to seek greater cost sharing from the military for this program.

Third, NASA should reduce funding within the fluid and thermal physics R&T Program by approximately \$1.4 million, for work on adaptable wall and magnetic balance wind tunnel test techniques.

Fourth, NASA should apply the funds saved by the above actions—about \$3 million—to high speed aeronautics.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would just add a couple more things in this regard.

The subcommittee and the committee feel very strongly that NASA should pursue strongly its work on high-speed aeronautics, hypersonic aircraft. I think we can do this. We can do it with appropriate environmental impact and we can do it to cause the United States to take the lead in the area of hypersonic aircraft.

No. 2, Mr. Chairman, this year the committee had the benefit of the Congressional Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, which is really a blue-ribbon, dollar-a-day group of people who, for the first time ever in my recollection in the history of government, spent over a year coming in and recommending changes in the NASA Program. While we did not buy every change that committee recommended, we had the opportunity for responsible private sector input into the NASA Aeronautics Program. I think that will improve the program and will also improve the way our aviation programs are handled in this country from the standpoint of the Government, NASA, and the FAA.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my chairman, Mr. NELSON, and the chairman of the full committee, Mr. FUQUA, the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. LUJAN, in support of H.R. 1714, the annual authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This is a bill that has been brought in with funding levels that are equal to the President's request to Congress. The Committee on Science and Technology carefully examined the budget request, and while we made a number of additions which were either above individual requests or represented items not included in the budget, we

were able to offset those additions with reductions in other planned NASA activities.

The President requested \$7,886 million for fiscal year 1986. The committee has made recommendations for \$69 million in increases and an offsetting \$69 million in reductions, for no net increase.

I would like to point out that the request for fiscal year 1986 represents a growth rate of 5 percent which, when adjusted for inflation, is a real growth rate of six-tenths of 1 percent. The committee fully supports this growth, which is required to support the space station initiative.

Let me make that clear. What we have in this budget is an attempt to try to provide a start for the future of the space station. That is what the addition is in here for. I understand that we are going to have arguments made on the floor later, I have seen copies of amendments, by people who are going to cut the budget back to last year's funding level and I understand that is a very attractive kind of thing, a supposed 5-percent reduction.

I assume that NASA, like everyone else, can probably find 5 percent to reduce, but I would make the point that the reason why there are increased levels in this budget is for one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to support the space station.

The President of the United States, despite the fact that he understands that we have got to do something about the deficits that we face, also understands that we have to project into the future. We have to understand that by the year 2010 we are capable of generating a trillion dollar new economy from outer space; that by the year 2050 we are capable of generating a \$4½ trillion economy in outer space.

□ 1630

The only way you can do that is with a space station. The only way that we are able to have that kind of an economic burgeoning in outer space is with a space station. As soon as you take out the space station, as soon as you begin to reduce the effort on the space station, you are eliminating much of our effort to move into that kind of a space future.

Now, I understand that we have got a lot of Luddites around the Congress here who are perfectly willing to cancel out science and technology and are perfectly willing to move away from the space station. I would say that some of that is penny wise and pound foolish. I come to the floor as someone who consistently comes to the floor saying that we can find ways to cut the budget. There is no doubt that we can find ways to cut this budget, too, and I am not going to be

really opposed to the concept of trying to attain a budget freeze.

But I think that we had better understand that we are going to have an impact on one of the great growth areas that the President himself had defined.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has led many deficit budget battles over the years and that is commendable, but as I understand from the office of the Director, Mr. Beggs, and from the staff of Mr. BOLAND's office, it is inaccurate to say that the 5 percent, to hold it to the 1985 levels, would not be correct in respect to the space stations. In essence NASA would take some dollars out of different programs, not totally across the board. The space station would not be jeopardized. There will be, therefore some additional reprogramming for the total program in the 1985-86 budget which we are debating in the authorization bill today. Also, it should be noted that the HUD and NASA House committee are holding testimony downstairs, the Director is present, and the information I have at this moment is that it would not jeopardize the space program.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that information, and I think it is valuable to have it on the record.

The point that I was making, however, is that the reason why the President increased this budget above last year's spending levels is because we do have the space station in it for \$230 million. That is the reason why we are in here at higher levels than what we spent last year. If we are not going to take it out of the space station, it is obvious then that NASA can find other places in the budget to take it out.

That is the reason why—if that is the point that the administration is peddling now, if the gentleman has just given us correct information and if Mr. Beggs says he can sustain a 5-percent cut, then I do not understand why any of us would be opposed to that out on the floor. I am glad to have that information from Mr. Beggs, and I wish he would have told the subcommittee that when he came before it because I think at this point we probably could have come up with a similar kind of proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify the record and say that I did not indicate that he endorsed a 5-percent reduction to go back to 1985. All I am saying is that he is in position to reprogram his money and earmark it for different programs that would not jeopardize the space station.

Now, that is according to HUD staff and people who are principally on the Democratic side of the aisle. So I am just suggesting, to be clear with the gentleman, that he did not indicate that he would support it, yes or no, on the amendment to reduce the budget. I did talk to him personally today. I did not put him in that position; I thought it was unfair to do so. And so we had a discussion in regard to the transfer dollars and the reprogramming efforts with respect to the whole budget.

Mr. WALKER. Then let me ask the gentleman, who is it that is telling us that the money can be easily programmed without jeopardizing the space station?

Mr. PURSELL. I am indicating the staff with which I met just recently and who are testifying downstairs with respect to the NASA and HUD budget. I would be happy to give those names to you.

Mr. WALKER. I am trying to clarify it here. Who is it? Is it NASA that is saying we can do this without jeopardizing the space station?

Mr. PURSELL. No; I did not say that. I indicated that staff members of HUD, the staff under Mr. BOLAND, indicated that there would likely occur, if the amendment were adopted, reprogramming efforts that would not jeopardize the space program.

Mr. WALKER. I understand the gentleman. And what I recall is that last year, when the staff came to the floor with Mr. BOLAND, they also adopted an amendment for a manned station rather than a permanently manned station, which would have been an attempt to undercut the whole manned station program. So what the gentleman is telling me is that the same staff that tried to undercut the program last year is now telling us that this cut will not undermine the program?

Somehow I have a problem understanding that, and I go back to my original statement that perhaps we are jeopardizing the space station here, because that is precisely the committee and the committee staff which undercut the program to some extent on the House floor last year. So I go back to my original point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON], the chairman of the

Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for the bill H.R. 1714, which would authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in fiscal year 1986.

This bill was reported by the Committee on Science and Technology on March 27, 1985, by voice vote.

For the benefit of the committee, I will summarize the bill and the actions taken.

The NASA fiscal year 1986 budget request was \$7.866 billion. The actions recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology result in a budget authorization of \$7.866 billion which is identical to the NASA request. With regard to space activities the committee is recommending \$59 million in increases and an offsetting \$59 million in decreases. The difference between the committee action and the administration's request for space activities are summarized as follows:

#### I. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

##### A. Space Transportation Capability Development.

\$5.0 million reduction in Spacelab activities.

\$3.0 million decrease in Payload Operations and Support Equipment.

\$7.0 million decrease in the Tethered Satellite System.

##### B. Physics and Astronomy.

\$7.0 million increase in Research and Analysis including \$4 million for a Shuttle test of the Gravity Probe B Experiment;

\$2 million in advanced technical development for the Advanced X-Ray Astronomical Facility, and \$1 million in Advanced Technical Development for the Space Infrared Telescope Facility.

\$3.0 million redirection within Shuttle/Spacelab Payload development activities to provide increased impetus for intermediate class payloads.

##### C. Space Applications.

\$4.0 million increase in Environmental Observations/Oceanic Processes research and analysis for advanced technical development for the Ocean Topography Experiment (TOPEX).

\$3.0 million increase in Environmental Observations/Space Physics Research and Analysis for advanced technical development for the International Solar Terrestrial Physics program.

\$8.0 million reduction in scatterometer instrument activities.

##### D. Commercial Use of Space.

\$10.0 million general reduction.

#### II. SPACE FLIGHT, CONTROL AND DATA COMMUNICATIONS

E. \$35.0 million increase in Space Shuttle Production/Operational Capability which is the net result of a \$45 million increase in orbiter activities for augmentation of Orbiter structural spaces, \$5 million decrease in Launch and Mission support, and a \$5 million decrease in Changes and Systems Upgrading.

F. \$10.0 million decrease in Space Transportation Operations activities.

G. \$5.0 million decrease in Space Tracking and Data Acquisition activities.



## III. CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

H. \$1.0 million general reduction.

## IV. RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

I. No change.

The Committee adopted a number of language provisions and deleted one provision proposed by the Administration as follows:

A. The Committee adopted a new Section 106 proposed by NASA which provides statutory oath administration authority to the NASA Inspector General staff in the performance of duties.

B. The Committee deleted a new Section 107 proposed by NASA which would amend the patent section of the Space Act of 1958 to provide that inventions in space under United States jurisdiction be considered made or used in the United States for purposes of patent law.

C. The Committee adopted a new Section 108 to clearly show the Subcommittee's intent with regard to the additional funding provided for Orbiter activities.

D. The Committee adopted a new Section 109 to extend the life of the National Commission on Space from "twelve months" to "eighteen months."

E. The Committee adopted a new Section 110 requiring the Administrator to review those recommendations of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control dealing with NASA and such other recommendations as may be included in the OMB report "Management of the United States Government—1986" and submit a report to Congress.

F. The Committee adopted a new Section 111 requiring the Administrator to initiate a feasibility study to ensure a timely flight opportunity for a physically disabled American.

G. The Committee adopted a new Title II which would establish a Space Shuttle Pricing Policy for the period fiscal year 1989-1991 which will be discussed more later.

H. The Committee adopted a new Title III, a provision to authorize funding for the Department of Transportation, Office of Commercial Space Transportation, which was established pursuant to the Commercial Space Launch Act.

In considering the NASA fiscal year 1986 budget request, the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications held 10 days of hearings in February and March 1985 to review the status of NASA space activities. Testimony was taken from representatives of NASA, the U.S. Air Force, the Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel, and the industrial and scientific community. The aeronautics activities of NASA were considered separately by the Subcommittee on Transportation, Aviation and Materials and will be discussed in detail by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN].

The NASA budget for fiscal year 1986 before you:

Includes \$230 million to continue systems definition studies and advanced technical development activities leading to development of a space station in the 1990's;

Provides funding for orbiter structural spares and operating spares to support the existing four orbiter fleet and to help maintain production readiness for a fifth orbiter vehicle;

Supports continued development of the space telescope for a late 1986 shuttle launch;

Schedules the Galileo mission to Jupiter for a 1986 shuttle launch using the shuttle/Centaur upper stage;

Continues support for flight missions such as Voyager and Pioneer that have been launched and are returning valuable scientific data;

Supports shuttle operations leading to an initial flight rate capability of 24 flights per year;

Authorizes continuation of U.S. support to the Ulysses with only the European spacecraft for launch in 1986;

Provides for continuation of the Upper Atmospheric Research Satellite Program and for the development of a scatterometer instrument for the Navy remote ocean sensing satellite;

Includes funds for continuing development of the Venus radar mapping mission and the Mars geoscience/climatology orbiter;

Includes funds for initiation of the Orbital Maneuvering Vehicle Program;

Continuing support to launch and operation of the tracking and data relay satellite system;

Supports NASA civil service employment levels at approximately 21,800;

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I want to address NASA's advanced program plans and the need for long-range civilian space goals. This committee has continually urged increased emphasis by NASA on long-range planning.

There is the continuing need to ensure U.S. preeminence in space for reasons of national morale, political prestige, advancement of U.S. science and technology, and educational motivation and stimulation. The development of new space systems goals and advanced programs beyond the basic space shuttle and the planned space station is a necessary consequence of this need for continued vitality in space, particularly in the light of a—to all appearances healthy and dynamic—Soviet space program.

The National Commission on Space which was established in last year's authorization and the membership of which was announced by the President last week should provide a valuable mechanism for public discussion of our Nation's long-range civilian space goals.

In the context of the clear needs which are presently foreseen, proper planning for the future will result in a balanced civilian space program which will make major contributions to our economy and national prestige.

NASA is one of the few Federal agencies whose spending power has decreased over 15 years. The spending power in the NASA budget is less than one-third of that 15 years ago. While NASA spending represented 4.4 percent of Federal budget outlays in fiscal year 1966, NASA spending repre-

sent less than eight-tenths of 1 percent of Federal budget outlays in fiscal 1986. These NASA budget trends do not recognize the positive contributions which the NASA programs can make to national defense, the Nation's economy, monitoring of our natural resources, energy and mineral exploration, and the expansion of scientific knowledge.

In developing the bill before us today, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for his efforts. I want to recognize the dedicated efforts of the members of the Committee on Science and Technology and, in particular, my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications. Each member of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle has made a significant contribution.

As always, we can depend on the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA], the chairman of the full committee, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN], the ranking Republican member of the committee for their knowledge and personal insight into these complex programs. Their diligent efforts continues to be of immeasurable help in establishing a sound bill and strong NASA programs.

## SPACE STATION

The space station will represent a fundamentally new and versatile capability to support activities in space in the decade of the 1990's and beyond.

While definition of a specific station configuration is yet ahead of us, it might be appropriate to describe conceptually what NASA now considers the station to encompass. A space station is conceived as a multipurpose permanent facility in low-Earth orbit, that is comprised of both manned and unmanned elements and that significantly enhances the efficiency of operations in space. The station would consist of a manned base and associated unmanned platforms, oriented to the needs of both science and applications missions, and man-tended from the base. The base and the platforms would be launched in modular sections carried into orbit in the cargo bay of the shuttle. The shuttle would also be used for logistics resupply and crew rotation.

For fiscal year 1986 NASA is requesting \$230 million for the space station program. NASA is continuing an extensive definition effort with sufficient resources to assure that the program, when hardware development is initiated, will be thoroughly defined, responsive to user requirements, and based on the proper mix of man and machine, incorporating the most advanced technology available. These definition efforts will include an automation plan to utilize the best of both manned and unmanned modes to achieve optimum productivity at the

station. The fiscal year 1986 effort will include continuing assessment of space station utilization requirements and continuation of a number of advanced development test beds to evaluate high leverage space station technology options. The fiscal year 1986 program will comprise the second year of this detailed engineering definition effort which will provide the basis for commitment to the final design for the construction of the space station.

#### SPACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

The space transportation system is at a critical phase at this time regarding the continuation of the capability to produce additional space shuttle orbiters. We have invested several billion dollars to develop this capability, a capability that puts this country in the forefront of an increasingly worldwide competitive space industry.

Yet, as we are just now on the verge of fully recognizing and exploring its uses and benefits, we are at the same time on the verge of losing the capability to build additional orbiters—the heart of the space transportation system. The space transportation system is a national system to be used as a national resource for civil and defense purposes.

The committee has recognized this problem by authorizing funds in the fiscal year 1984, fiscal year 1985, and fiscal year 1986 NASA budgets to procure orbiter structural spares and to maintain production readiness for a fifth orbiter vehicle.

This funding will keep the nationwide network of major orbiter structural subcontractors from further closing down their manufacturing capability, while the need for additional orbiters receives more study. These structural components will be used as spares to the current orbiter fleet in the event of major structural damage. Such major damage could have a significant impact on the ability of NASA to meet its launch commitments. By having the structural spares available, this impact can be lessened. Should a decision be made at a later time that an additional orbiter is required, these structural components will be used to build that orbiter. By having these components such as wings, vertical stabilizer, crew compartment available, the manufacturing effort to build an orbiter will be reduced.

I urge your support of this logical approach to an issue of vital national interest. It is an approach that allows us to continue to study this problem as we gain additional flight experience and evaluate the results of the new marketing initiatives that are being undertaken along with the resultant mission demands. The four orbiter fleet now authorized can meet mission demands for the next 4 or so years. But we know that these demands are almost certain to grow; the exact timing of this growth is difficult to

predict. However, the long lead times involved in building an orbiter make it mandatory that we not close off our manufacturing capability at this time.

#### PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY

In 1982 the National Academy of Sciences published a report entitled, "Astronomy and Astrophysics for the 1980's" popularly referred to as the Field study after its leader, professor George Field. This report, based on a consensus of the U.S. astronomical community, is of great value in laying out a blueprint for astronomy and astrophysics for the coming decade. The recommendations in this report deserve serious and prompt attention by NASA with a view toward implementation.

The committee notes that the field study endorsed two major projects which were assumed to be firm commitments. That is, these projects were taken as already approved, and the study focused on the follow-on projects. These two major projects were the shuttle infrared telescope facility [SIRTF] and the solar optical telescope [SOT]. It is of concern, however, that neither of these programs are progressing at a satisfactory rate toward the dates originally projected. This survey further recommended the advanced x ray astrophysics facility as the highest priority future astronomy program.

The committee recommended modest increases in the advanced technical development activities for the shuttle infrared telescope facility and the advanced x ray astrophysics facility and for laboratory equipment and instrumentation.

Another major emphasis of the Field study was the need to strengthen the infrastructure of the astronomy and astrophysical sciences. Vigorous basic research programs at U.S. universities are essential for training future scientists and engineers and ultimately, for dissemination of the latest scientific results to university students and the general public. Grants awarded through NASA's Research and Analysis Program provide a direct stimulus to the academic community and are the mainstay for the infrastructure in the astronomical and astrophysical sciences.

#### PLANETARY RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

The Planetary Exploration Program encompasses the scientific exploration of the solar system including the planets and their satellites, comets, and asteroids, and the interplanetary medium. The program objectives are: (1) to determine the nature of planets, comets, and asteroids as a means for understanding the origin and evolution of the solar system; (2) to understand the Earth better through comparative studies with the other planets; (3) to understand how the appearance of life in the solar system is related to the chemical history of the solar

system; and, (4) to provide a scientific basis for the future use of resources available in near-Earth space. Projects undertaken in the past have been highly successful. The strategy that has been adopted calls for a balanced emphasis on the Earth-like inner planets, the giant gaseous outer planets, and the small bodies (comets and asteroids). Missions to these bodies start at the level of reconnaissance to achieve a fundamental characterization of the bodies, and then proceed to levels of more detailed study.

In the past several years, the administration's budget request for planetary research and analysis has been, in the opinion of the committee, inadequate. As a result the committee has added a significant amount of money to this line item for the past several years. However, for fiscal year 1986, the agency request for research and analysis is adequate. Accordingly, the committee has added no funding. The request includes adequate technology development funding for the comet rendezvous and asteroid flyby mission. The committee did have to add funding for other missions for which the request was inadequate and has made it clear in report language that the adding of funds for other missions is not intended to imply any bias against the CRAF mission.

#### MATERIALS PROCESSING IN SPACE

The materials processing in the space program is establishing a research base on the role of gravitational influences in the processing of materials, particularly those of high technological interest. There is a growing awareness now that phenomena such as convection, sedimentation, and buoyancy during fluid phase processing can limit the perfection and performance of an extremely wide range of materials and processes from semiconductor crystals to biological separation techniques. The key to obtaining this knowledge lies in sound research and in the ability to eliminate gravity for times long enough for measurement and experimentation.

The materials processing in the space program has a strong commitment to the former; and, the shuttle now provides the unique and complementary opportunity for the latter. The benefits to both terrestrial as well as space processing can well be substantive—a view clearly shared by Russia, Europe, and Japan, who all now have active MPS programs as well. The NASA MPS Program also assists in the commercialization of space processing by establishing unique arrangements for industry/Government risk sharing in proof-of-concept joint endeavors. These no-exchange-of-funds programs produce benefits, not only to American industry, but to the research based NASA MPS Program as well.



Again, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1714, the NASA fiscal year 1986 authorization.

□ 1640

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1714, authorizing appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1986.

I am pleased that we were able to stay within the President's request this year. It was not easy—there are so many worthwhile programs—it is truly unfortunate that some had to be cut. However, given the budget constraints we must face, I believe this bill provides for a sound NASA program for the coming year.

The Aeronautics R&D Program authorized in this bill reflects an increase of just under 3½ percent which barely accounts for inflation. I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I say I wish we could augment this very worthwhile program. Aerospace is one of the few areas where we still enjoy a favorable trade balance, and this is in no small measure due to the outstanding aeronautics research and technology provided by NASA through the programs authorized in this bill.

I am especially pleased that we were able to provide some real growth in the R&T base activities this year. These programs were increased by \$17 million or 7.6 percent over last year's appropriation. Too often in the past the R&T base programs have been viewed as a source of funds to satisfy special interests. But without these programs there would be no technology base for the future—so it is particularly satisfying to me that this did not happen this year.

And, I might add, that this was accomplished without sacrificing the propan program this year. I am happy to report that this very important program will go forward as planned with the flight validation still scheduled for 1987.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to your attention a report that was released earlier this week by Dr. Keyworth, Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy outlining the national goals for aeronautics R&D. This report was the result of a 2-year study by the Aeronautics Policy Review Committee established by Dr. Keyworth. The committee, composed of government, industry, and academic experts, recommended three major goals for aeronautics R&D into the 21st century.

First, we must advance the technologies needed to develop a new genera-

tion of quieter, more economical subsonic aircraft. This will benefit not only civil aircraft, but military aircraft as well by providing increased payloads and range, reduced maintenance, and increased operational flexibility.

The second goal is the development of the technology necessary for sustained supersonic flight—which also has potential application for both civil and military aircraft.

And, finally, the third goal is the convergence of aeronautical and space technologies and the exploration of the transatmospheric regime. This is a particularly visionary goal, and one which the Committee on Science and Technology has consistently supported.

Mr. Chairman, these are all lofty goals—made all the more difficult because of our constrained aeronautics budget—but I believe the Aeronautics Program in this bill is directed toward those goals, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting the fiscal year 1986 NASA authorization bill.

Thank you.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. I am most happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague, the gentleman from Florida yielding.

First, let me say that I believe the entire House should extend their congratulations to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA], our chairman, and to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN], the ranking member, and also to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

Further, I would very much like to associate myself with the remarks of our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON] for they reflected very much my experience in the work we have done in the field of NASA's effort in my Subcommittee on Appropriations that deals with their budget.

Further, I would like to specifically rise in support of the language in the authorization bill which strongly urges NASA's continued efforts to explore the viability of a second source for the shuttle solid rocket motors. Injecting competition into this field would be another significant step in advancing the progress we are already making.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of language in the authorization bill which strongly urges NASA's continued efforts to explore the viability of a second source for the shuttle solid rocket motors.

As the Members know, to a large degree the future commercial success of the shuttle depends on costs. We must find areas where costs can be re-

duced and proceed vigorously to implement those savings.

The history of competition in Government procurement in general, and in the area of propulsion specifically, suggests that significant savings can be made on the shuttle's solid rocket motors.

Several major propulsion companies have already indicated to NASA a strong interest in competing on the solid boosters. While each of the companies would in all probability have different costs projections, one chief executive officer advised me recently that at current costs, with a 24-per-year-flight rate at the end of the decade, savings to NASA between 1988-99 would be \$1 billion.

And so Mr. Chairman, we sense that this is an area of tremendous importance to the Shuttle Program and I encourage NASA to review this matter most carefully, particularly in view of discussion about the future need for large boosters for heavy lift vehicles.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

I want to commend the chairman and the members of the Science and Technology Committee for their fine work, especially the chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON] and my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] who has been a fine new member of that committee.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has written some of the most brilliant success stories in American history. Today, NASA continues its ground-breaking research and development, providing new technology and changing the way we perceive ourselves and the universe. The money spent on NASA is one of the most cost-effective investments we can make and I offer my wholehearted support to this legislation and encourage my colleagues to vote for it.

Those of us from Ohio are particularly proud of NASA because of the work performed by the men and women at the Lewis Research Center in Cleveland. The Centaur, for example, has powered missions to Mars and put a payload in geosynchronous orbit 22,000 miles above the Earth. In the field of aeronautics propulsion, the Lewis Center's Advanced Turboprop project is proceeding on schedule to complement work already performed on fuel efficient aircraft engines. Lewis is also NASA's lead center for satellite communications.

Finally, I must mention the lead role that the Lewis Center has played in space power development. This particular area of expertise will become

increasingly important in the years to come as NASA proceeds with the space station, the major step in space exploration. The power requirements for the space station will require the development of new systems and technology. The research and development will be performed at the Lewis Research Center.

Our country was developed by people who were always looking toward the horizon, curious to see what they would find. That same curiosity has taken men to the Moon and sent satellites beyond our solar system. The spiritual and economic benefits of the work performed by NASA are impossible to forecast or calculate. Based on past performance, though, we can confidently assert that those benefits will be immense. This legislation will make the resources available for our brightest scientists and engineers to keep advancing the horizon for all of us. Our continued progress as a nation depends on the kind of activities this bill will make possible. I urge bipartisan support for the legislation.

□ 1650

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH].

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1714, the NASA authorization for fiscal year 1986.

I would like to commend the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee for their efforts in reporting out a sound and well balanced piece of legislation which is funded at the same level as the President's request.

H.R. 1714 provides authorization for a number of important programs within the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I am especially pleased that the bill provides \$230 million for continued design and research on a manned space station, which is the requested amount.

The space station will serve to invigorate American industry by distributing over 75 percent of the space station's systems investment to industry; and also by creating an environment of industry competition for space station design and development contracts. This will help to maintain this country's position at the cutting edge of new and innovative technology.

I was pleased to note in the report that the committee has taken an interest in the area of space access for the physically disabled. On Earth, disabled people face barriers that limit their opportunities to be fully productive. In the zero-gravity environment of space, all barriers to access are removed, and all people equally weightless. As someone with longstanding interest and experience in working with the handicapped, I applaud the committee's view that the inclusion of a

disabled person on future missions affords a historic opportunity to prove that those handicapped on Earth may be freed to become highly valuable and fully productive members of the space-based materials processing economy of the future.

The bill provides \$45 million to maintain production readiness for an additional orbiter vehicle. While I am pleased that the lines will remain open, I believe a policy decision on the funding of a fifth orbiter is long overdue. I think it is the consensus of the members of the committee that there is a need for a fifth orbiter, and I am sorry funding for it has not been provided in this bill.

Nevertheless, I want to emphasize that I support this bill, and remain an enthusiastic advocate of NASA and the space program. I urge my colleagues to vote favorably on H.R. 1714.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], a member of the committee.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 1714, which would authorize fiscal year 1986 appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I congratulate the chairman of the full committee, Mr. Fuqua, and the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Nelson, for bringing a basically sound bill to the floor. I also congratulate the senior Republican Member, Mr. Lujan, and the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. Walker, for the high degree of cooperation that they demonstrated as we worked on this bill together.

Although I have some reservations about this bill, I do want to particularly commend the committee for two actions. First, the committee added advanced technology development funding for several science missions to keep them moving toward start of their development in future years. Second, the committee approved my amendment to earmark \$3 million for shuttle intermediate-class payload development. I appreciate the committee's recognition of the need to provide for more frequent shuttle flight opportunities for scientists.

Mr. Chairman, in authorizing fiscal year 1986 funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Science and Technology Committee has fallen short of the commitment made to the committee by Administrator Beggs for 1 percent real growth for the agency. The shortfall is not large and would not be of great concern if the committee's actions were driven by a more overriding principle than remaining within the budget levels submitted by the administration. As the authorizing committee, we have the responsibility for setting national space policy. But we have fallen short

of this lofty goal, and have chosen instead to allow NASA programs to coast for yet another year while we fail to recognize and acknowledge our role as policymakers.

When compared with the growth in military space programs, the NASA funding levels look even bleaker. We now spend nearly twice as much on military space programs as we do on NASA's space programs. In fiscal year 1985, for example, the military is expected to spend approximately \$13 billion compared to NASA's \$7 billion on space programs. The difference between civilian and military spending in space will become even more pronounced if the President's strategic defense initiative goes forward as planned. Below is a chart from the Congressional Budget Office which shows the funding trend for NASA versus Defense Department spending on space programs.

SPACE ACTIVITIES OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT; HISTORICAL BUDGET SUMMARY—BUDGET AUTHORITY

(In millions of dollars)

Fiscal year	NASA		Defense
	Total	Space <sup>1</sup>	
1959	330.9	260.9	489.5
1960	523.6	461.5	560.9
1961	964.0	925.0	813.9
1962	1,824.9	1,796.8	1,298.2
1963	3,673.0	3,626.0	1,549.9
1964	5,099.7	5,016.3	1,599.3
1965	5,249.7	5,137.6	1,573.9
1966	5,174.9	5,064.5	1,688.8
1967	4,965.6	4,830.2	1,663.6
1968	4,587.3	4,430.0	1,921.8
1969	3,980.9	3,822.0	2,013.0
1970	3,745.8	3,547.0	1,678.4
1971	3,311.2	3,101.3	1,512.3
1972	3,306.6	3,071.0	1,407.0
1973	3,406.2	3,093.2	1,623.0
1974	3,036.9	2,758.5	1,766.0
1975	3,229.1	2,915.3	1,892.4
1976	3,550.3	3,225.4	1,983.3
Transitional quarter	931.8	849.2	460.4
1977	3,817.8	3,440.2	2,411.9
1978	4,060.1	3,622.9	2,738.3
1979	4,595.5	4,030.4	3,035.6
1980	5,240.2	4,680.4	3,848.4
1981	5,518.4	4,992.4	4,827.7
1982	* 6,043.9	5,527.6	6,678.7
1983	6,875.3	6,327.0	9,018.0
1984 estimate	7,217.0	6,590.0	10,590.0
1985 estimate	7,491.4	6,804.3	12,912.7

<sup>1</sup> Excludes amounts for air transportation (subfunction 402).

\* Includes \$33.5 million unobligated funds that lapsed.

Let me now go into a little more detail about NASA's science and applications programs and the actions that the committee has taken:

First, I would like to make special note of the progress made in the committee in recognizing the need for more frequent shuttle flight opportunities for university scientists. Testimony in support of the Shuttle Science Working Group report of September 1984 indicated the need to develop intermediate class payload opportunities to fill the gap between the spacelab capabilities and the getaway specials, and recommended a \$25 million per year budget for this activity. The committee earmarked \$3 million for intermediate-class payload development, and adopted report language



urging the agency to develop this program, and to report to the committee on its progress and on future plans. This is a small step in support of this important activity.

The committee recognized the importance of advancing fundamental science and applications by supporting, although at minimal levels, the gravity probe-B [GP-B] experiment, the ocean topography experiment [TOPEX], the x-ray astronomy facility [AXAF], the shuttle infrared telescope facility [SIRTF], and the international solar terrestrial physics [ISTP] program. Unfortunately, however, the meager funding supplements provided in this bill for these programs do not add up to any badly needed new starts this year, a matter of concern in the out-years when other important programs will be delayed as a consequence. Nevertheless, the additional funds added for TOPEX, ISTP, and GP-B will be helpful in moving these programs toward fiscal year 1987 new starts, and are appreciated by the scientific community.

I would like to say a few words about these exciting science missions. For more than 20 years, NASA has funded an experiment, gravity probe-B, that would test a particular effect predicted by Einstein's general theory of relativity. The effect predicted is very small, so that a delicate and expensive apparatus is needed, and, for the same reason, the experiment must be done in the zero-gravity conditions of space. With the advent of the shuttle, it is possible to conduct a test aboard the shuttle to see if the apparatus will work before committing funding for the full experiment. The committee added \$4 million to move the agency toward the shuttle test of this relatively experiment.

The infant field of x-ray astronomy was invigorated by the high-energy astronomy observatory satellites 1 and 2, but they stopped returning data in 1981. NASA plans to follow up this successful start by building the advanced x-ray astronomy facility [AXAF]. Because AXAF would utilize very advanced x-ray optics, these optics could present a significant risk to the development program. Therefore, the committee added \$2 million for continued advanced technology development of AXAF in order to minimize technical uncertainties and to indicate a commitment to the eventual start of development of this mission.

The field of infrared astronomy was revolutionized by the infrared astronomy satellite [IRAS], which conducted an all-sky survey from space, and NASA plans to follow with the space infrared telescope facility [SIRTF]. There is a need to develop and test technologies for the maintenance and servicing of this cryogenically cooled telescope so it can be operated for a period of years—a significant improve-

ment over the 1-year lifetime of IRAS. Therefore, the committee added \$1 million for advanced technology development of this mission.

The committee added \$4 million for the ocean topography experiment [TOPEX] to prepare for a fast start on its development. TOPEX was planned for a 1990 launch—based on an expected fiscal year 1986 start which is not included in this bill—in order to achieve maximum overlap with the NROSS satellite [Navy resource observation satellite] and thus make maximum impact on the world ocean climate experiment [WOCE] and the tropical ocean global atmosphere [TOGA] research programs. An increment to the TOPEX budget will enable efforts to begin the integration of science instruments onto the spacecraft.

The international solar terrestrial physics [ISTP] program is planned as a six-satellite joint program between NASA, three satellites; the European Space Agency, two satellites; and Japan, one satellite. The United States has indicated to its foreign partners its intent to carry out this program, and a new start has been anticipated in fiscal year 1986. A small investment now in detailed studies of the science instruments and related engineering tradeoffs could minimize program runout cost and prevent schedule delays. Therefore, the committee added \$3 million to prepare for an early start on development of the program.

The programs I just mentioned are a few examples of the very exciting scientific research that NASA is involved with. As I mentioned earlier, the funding supplements provided by the committee are welcomed, but I am concerned about the long-term funding trend in NASA's space science and applications programs. I have been assured that the absence of new starts this year is not indicative of reduced commitment to space science. I hope this is true. But in the attempt to keep spending down this year, we may be adding to the ultimate costs of these projects, and thus to the overall Federal budget, by feeding standing armies to keep scientific teams together.

Our inability to make a long-term commitment to the health of the space sciences is perhaps most evident in our universities. Dr. George Keyworth, the President's science adviser, described the status of university research facilities as "disgraceful and deplorable" in his confirmation hearings in 1981, and he noted that the situation offers "unattractive prospects" for those interested in pursuing careers in experimental science. Countless witnesses have since testified before our own committee on the situation today in which we are training the next generation of space sci-

tists and engineers on antiquated equipment.

Both the National Science Foundation and the Department of Defense have recognized the university instrumentation problem and have devoted significant resources to it. The erosion of our universities' laboratory equipment is not a problem that is going to be solved overnight. The amendment which I offered in the committee to devote \$11 million to the problem for fiscal year 1986 would not, by itself, have made a significant difference without a similar commitment next year, and for years after that. Yet the committee rejected this modest attempt to begin to address this issue.

But the space sciences and applications programs are not the only areas where the lack of a coherent space policy is evident and disturbing. Determining national policy with regard to the related issues of the space shuttle, the need for a fifth orbiter, pricing policy, the space station, and space science is a difficult task. As a long-time member of the Space Science and Application Subcommittee, I have participated for over 10 years in developing national space policy. I have been an enthusiastic and strong supporter of our Nation's space programs, and of the shuttle program in particular. However, this support does not preclude taking a critical look at the way Federal dollars are allocated to NASA.

The United States currently operates a fleet of four space shuttles, counting the Atlantis, which will be delivered later this year. Since fiscal year 1983, NASA has stockpiled spare parts in the event that a decision is made to procure a fifth space shuttle. By the end of fiscal year 1985, NASA will have been given \$400 million for this program. But according to testimony of NASA Administrator James Beggs, there is no need for a fifth shuttle orbiter.

Over the last decade, the expected number of shuttle missions has decreased from over 500 to around 300 missions through 1991. Administrator Beggs, in testimony before our committee, said "we could fly these things—the current shuttle fleet—until well into the second or third decade of the 21st century at the flight rate we are projecting now." Yet the bill before us adds \$45 million to the administration request for shuttle structural spares to "keep the production lines open" for another year to protect a future option to procure a fifth orbiter.

Mr. Chairman, in a year when critical programs are being eliminated or cut to the bone, it is a mystery to me why we insist on protecting our option to procure an unneeded fifth orbiter at some future hypothetical date at a price tag of somewhere between \$2 and \$3 billion. I would like to note

that NASA and the Department of Defense are engaged in a study of our future space transportation needs. NASA should be supported in this endeavor, and ought to be forging ahead on the cutting edge of space technology as was done with the Space Shuttle Program. NASA should be looking ahead to second generation space transportation, not building another space truck.

I have raised these issues resulting from the absence of a coherent national space policy, in the past. Clearly, the problems will not be solved overnight, nor will the solutions be simple, nor will everyone agree on how best to proceed. But we can't postpone the solutions indefinitely. Perhaps one witness before our committee said it best when he remarked that "each year these problems are not addressed, they become more critical and difficult to solve. We are prepared to wait another year and to watch our scientific enterprise coast for a little way, but we also clearly recognize that this cannot be allowed to continue for long. We urge the Congress to begin planning a solution now."

Mr. Chairman, I am in support of this bill. It is not from my standpoint the best bill in the world and I have some reservations about many parts of it. But I think the committee and the committee leadership has worked diligently to bring to the floor a bill they consider to be balanced and satisfactory.

Let me speak for just a moment in a general way about why I have reservations about this bill. And I do this because I do not want to have the Members swayed by my views unless they share some of my biases.

I have always had a vision about space. I have measured the space program against that vision. It is a vision which was enunciated a generation ago by great Presidents such as Eisenhower and Kennedy, a vision about the tremendous values which space held for the benefit of all mankind and about a role for the United States as a leader in the search to explore this new frontier.

I think we have lost that vision and it is that loss of vision which causes me so much pain as we debate the bill this year.

Let me mention a few of the things that cause me to say this. Today we hardly have a civilian space program. More than 75 percent of our space program is military, funded by the Department of Defense. And it is being used in accordance with a long-range plan to develop space as an extension of the arena of war on Earth. That disturbs me very deeply because I think that we could and should draw a line against putting weapons in space, and we could set a new standard for what the human race might do cooperatively in space rather than

making it an extension of the arms race and the battlefields which we are trying to avoid here on Earth.

So that is the No. 1 problem that faces me, the problem that pressures from the Department of Defense, which in the last 5 years has increased its space spending more than the total NASA budget today, is something which is forcing us into making compromises in the civilian space program that we should not have to make.

What has happened in the civil space program? We have no strategic plan for it. We in the Congress last year decided to set up a commission to give us some ideas about long-range plans. The membership of that commission was not even appointed until last week.

I do not think there is much enthusiasm in this administration to encourage long-range thinking about civil space programs. What has happened is that the vision of space as a new frontier for man's exploration has gone down the tubes.

We had a magnificent program, magnificent visions of what man could do in exploring the solar system. Yet we have not had a new start in years, and we are not going to have any major new starts in exploring the solar system for years to come.

We have a dozen major new scientific experiments lined up waiting to be launched. None of those are being started this year.

Yes, the chairman wisely allocated a small amount of money to continue with the definition of these projects and to do some of the preliminary development. But no new major scientific starts are authorized in this budget.

The condition of university research in space science is going downhill. There is inadequate funding for the enhancement of laboratory facilities and for the analysis of data. We have starved these needs, instead, spending the money for programs, worthy in themselves, and more politically attractive, such as the space station. But the science programs have been starved because of that, a fate which the National Academy of Sciences anticipated in its report on the space station.

Possibly more important, vital applications programs, programs that could result in the development of new industries here on Earth and in space have been thwarted and frustrated in part because of lack of funds and in part because of policy barriers set up which NASA could not control. And I am delicately alluding here to certain restrictions flowing out of DOD requirements that face us. These restrictions have prevented the development of healthy applications programs which could provide the opportunity for this trillion dollars in new commercial activity referred to by our distin-

guished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

That is a minimum of what we could expect if we were to allow the civil space program to develop in the way that it should.

□ 1700

This bill does not fulfill that vision, and it is that vision which I am measuring it against. There are many important policy areas that are not being adequately dealt with in this bill. The shuttle pricing policy is one example, and we will debate this policy during the amendment period.

We are faced with contradictions in that policy which we cannot resolve. We are seeking to establish pricing policies for foreign and commercial payloads which will make us competitive with Ariane, the French system. If we do that, we put the domestic, commercial, expendable launch vehicle business out of business. And we want to cultivate that expendable launch business, and we are not being able to do that.

So we have not been able to resolve these contradictions. I will develop this a little further during debate in the amendment process.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. I know of no program in the United States at the present time that has done more to encourage our young people to pursue academic excellence in science and technology than has our space program.

I have certainly come onto this committee heartily endorsing the program and certainly I am rising now to support H.R. 1717, authorizing appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1986.

Aeronautical research and technology programs typically precede aeronautical development and production by many years. The cycle in which a theoretical analysis or a laboratory experiment leads to large-scale testing which results in a proven technology advance may run 10 to 15 years—and the design, development, and production process by which the new technology is incorporated in an actual airplane can take another 6 to 8 years. The Air Force C-17 airlift transport, just now entering full-scale engineering development, uses NASA winglets conceived in 1973 and tested in 1975. It also incorporates one of the first applications of a propulsive lift concept first developed and tested at NASA Langley in the fifties.

The supercritical aerodynamics research conducted by NASA in the sixties now provides much of the basis for the wing designs employed on today's transports and fighters. And in



areas where high-speeds are not essential, such as fans, compressors, and the small General Aviation aircraft, industry still uses the NACA low-drag airfoil sections developed even 10 to 15 years earlier.

The NASA "Refan" program of the early 1970's not only demonstrated an important noise reduction concept, but provided an approach and an impetus to a new engine development which has made possible transport aircraft, such as the McDonnell Douglas DC-9 "dash 80" and subsequent derivatives, which exhibit major savings in fuel. And the energy efficient engine research started by NASA several years later has provided technology now being incorporated in more advanced engines which will be even more fuel efficient.

NASA configuration concepts developed and tested in the sixties strongly influenced the designs of the F-14 and F-15 fighters now in service.

Numerous other examples could be cited, including the increased use of composite structures, the development of advanced flight management controls and displays, and the availability of new fire-resistant materials, all based on NASA-sponsored research during the last decade. And one final contribution—indirect but important—should be recognized: The unique NASA environment and programs have provided invaluable training for a number of top engineers who now apply their technical expertise and experience in key positions throughout the civilian aeronautics industry.

Not all of NASA's work lead to successful development of new technology, to be sure. High-risk aeronautical research, apart from being time-consuming and expensive, can never be counted upon to produce a profitable return for the private investor or a reliable basis for military development. For that reason, we must depend on NASA to continue conducting the broad, future-oriented, high-risk research that cannot be supported by the private sector of the DOD. Only with an assured supply of superior technology can our aircraft manufacturers continue to develop the superior U.S. civil and military aircraft on which we all depend.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, H.R. 1714, which authorizes the appropriate authorization levels for the space program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

At this time the Chair would like to advise the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] that he has 8 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN] has 6 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA].

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman

from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], who is chairman of the subcommittee that deals with this budget on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Science and Technology Committee for yielding this time to me. I want to congratulate the chairman of the House Science and Technology Committee, the gentleman from Florida, and the chairman of the Space Science and Applications Subcommittee, Mr. NELSON, on reporting this very fine bill; and also the ranking minority member, Mr. LUJAN, of the Science and Technology Committee for their efforts on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I was particularly pleased to read the section of the bill dealing with the shuttle pricing issue. I wrote the gentleman from Florida in January and suggested that the shuttle was at the crossroads: Either we were going to continue to support this \$18 billion investment by ensuring that the price for the shuttle was set at a level that would enhance the development of space, or we were going to see the space transportation system gradually atrophy to a launch rate of something less than 11 or 12 per year.

I believe the subcommittee has taken a bold step in setting a ceiling on the shuttle price at \$71.4 million for the period 1989 through 1991. I also believe the committee's action is essential to maintain the viability of both the shuttle and this Nation's effort to advance the commercialization of space.

Without freezing the shuttle price, we would see virtually every commercial communications satellite launched by Ariane. After spending \$18 billion on the shuttle, somehow that does not make sense, and it has not made sense to this committee.

I also want to assure the gentleman that we in the Committee on Appropriations will make an effort to reference by citation the shuttle pricing language carried in this authorization bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, on balance, I believe that your committee has done an excellent job with this bill. I do, however, want to add one note of caution: We are operating in a different atmosphere this year, and the HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee which I chair faces inequities among the agencies carried in our bill—including the fact that incremental units for HUD's subsidized housing program was zeroed for fiscal years 1986 and 1987.

In the past, our subcommittee has prided itself on producing an appropriations bill as early as possible, and almost always before the beginning of the fiscal year. But in all candor, I will have to admit that this year we could find ourselves, along with all the other

subcommittee appropriations bills, in a continuing resolution.

I do not know how that will affect the NASA appropriation, particularly in relation to other agencies in the HUD bill—but you can be assured, Mr. Chairman, that we will do our best. I want to congratulate you and your committee on reporting an excellent bill.

□ 1710

Mr. Chairman, I want to make something very clear here. My friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], suggested that last year the HUD Subcommittee undercut the space station with a man-tended effort. He is wrong. We actually added \$5.5 million for the space station to help fund the man-tended option, bringing the 1985 total to \$155.5 million. We believed the man-tended options was important, and we still do—because some day you may have to use it.

On the other point, the gentleman from Pennsylvania indicated that the 5-percent increase from the 1985 level to the 1986 request was for the space station. That is also wrong. Of that \$375 million, only \$75 million is for the space station. We asked the Administrator yesterday how he would address a reduction of that magnitude, and he did not suggest that a nickel would come from the space station.

So I thought the gentleman from Pennsylvania would like to have the record corrected, and I do so.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CHANDLER].

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Chairman, it would be difficult, I think, to find any effort funded whole or in part by this Federal Government which does not deserve an increase in budget authority. Most of the programs we are going to authorize in this Congress are not only worthwhile but could all use additional budget authority.

And then beyond that, I think we would be hard pressed to think of a program that is any more worthy of greater budget authority than NASA. The success of our space program has been an inspiration to all mankind. The benefits to the private sector of our economy have been direct, immediate, and substantial.

But we can talk until we are blue in the face about reining in Federal spending and getting a handle on that \$200 billion deficit, and we are not going to get anywhere by voting for increases in authorization bills.

If we are going to bring down the deficit, we are going to have to start with an across-the-board freeze. That is an absolute minimum. And that only brings the deficit down by \$38 billion. Then we have to build on that

\$38 billion base with additional cuts, every single one of them painful.

And we cannot bring about an across-the-board freeze if we vote to increase budget authority for even the best program by 5 percent over the fiscal 1985 funding level.

I support NASA and I support funding NASA at current levels, but I cannot support an increase in the face of a \$200 billion deficit. We owe it to the working people of our country, to our children, and our grandchildren to rein in this deficit.

I plan to vote today for the Morrison amendment which will scale this back to 1985 levels and then I can support it.

I also want to say that my remarks should not be construed as being critical of Mr. FUQUA, Mr. NELSON, Mr. LUJAN, or Mr. WALKER. They are gentlemen with whom I serve on the committee, and I have the highest regard for them. My purpose today is to explain to you why something that is very important to me personally and something that is very important to my district cannot be supported. I can see the day when I am going to have to stand in front of a group of poor, elderly, whatever, and explain to them why they did not get an increase in their budget authority; and I do not want to have to explain why NASA got one and why I supported it. We have got to be consistent and we have got to start now. It cannot be business as usual in anything that we do, including NASA.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1986, H.R. 1714, which is being brought to the floor today by the Committee on Science and Technology.

I congratulate the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA], and the chairman of the subcommittee, another gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON], for providing a well crafted and fiscally responsible bill.

In accomplishing this, we had the full support and the full cooperation of the minority, led by the senior Republican member, Mr. LUJAN from New Mexico, and the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. WALKER from Pennsylvania.

In particular, I want to commend the committee for two items that were highlighted in its report accompanying the bill (H. Rept. 99-32).

First, the committee stressed the need for the United States to have a vigorous development in remote sensing and the need for NASA and NOAA to cooperate in this matter.

I certainly support that.

Second, the committee strongly endorsed the International Biosphere/Geosphere Program, a program of research which would treat the Earth as a living system.

This program becomes more important as we are faced with problems—such as the carbon dioxide greenhouse effect—which are global in extent and which involve all systems of the Earth, it oceans, atmosphere and biosphere.

Let me now go into more detail about the two programs which I have mentioned. Both these programs will require significant interaction between NASA and NOAA and I want my colleagues to know that as chairman of the subcommittee which deals with NOAA's Atmospheric Research Programs, I intend to encourage them and ensure a great deal of cooperation between these two agencies.

Last year, our committee reported and Congress enacted the Land Remote-Sensing Commercialization Act of 1984, which became Public Law 98-365. Section 501(a) of that act directs NASA to continue and to enhance [its] programs of remote-sensing research and development. The most noteworthy recent event in NASA's Remote-Sensing Program has been its cancellation of virtually all of the work it was conducting on advanced technology using solid-state sensors, known as the multilinear array technology. Because of this, I have concluded that contrary to the legislative intent the agency has neither continued nor enhanced its Remote-Sensing Program. Certainly I do not see the vigorous program of R&D that was envisioned when we developed the language of Public Law 98-365.

At this point I want to make it very clear that I am not questioning the work that NASA is doing in this area, but rather the work it is not doing. In other words, the quality is acceptable, but the quantity is lacking. In particular, there seems to be much too little work on applications of remote sensing from space. If commercialization is ever going to succeed, there needs to be a great deal of research done on how this data from space can be of use here on Earth. The committee and I personally maintain great faith that this technology has the potential to be of great benefit to all mankind. But the benefits will not just happen without a great deal of hard work. And for this reason NASA must support the research, especially applications research, necessary to realize and achieve these potential benefits.

Section 501(e) of Public Law 98-365 calls for a national plan for research and development to be jointly developed by NOAA and NASA, and submitted to the Congress by July 17, 1985. I am looking forward to the timely receipt of this report and am

urging NOAA to cooperate fully with NASA in its development.

In its report on H.R. 1714, which I fully support, the committee reiterated that it considered the Nation's remote sensing capabilities as an important national asset. Public Law 98-365 recognized this by providing that any commercial activity must operate so as to preserve the public interest and our national security. NASA's research activity should support this national asset just as NASA's Communications Research and Development program supports our national communications satellite industry.

Let me now turn my attention to the International Geosphere/Biosphere Program [IGBP], which is a proposed program of international and interdisciplinary research aimed at understanding the Earth as a living planet. More specifically, the program would seek to describe and understand, first, the interactive physical, chemical, and biological processes that regulate the Earth's unique environment for life; second, the changes occurring in the system; and third, how these changes are influenced by human actions.

This idea surfaced as a U.S. initiative at the "Unispace '82" meeting in Vienna, Austria. It was advanced by activities at the National Research Council of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, and last September was formally considered by the International Council of Scientific Unions [ICSU]. ICSU subsequently adopted a resolution to investigate the possibility of such a formal international research program and formed an advisory group to make a recommendation for its implementation at the next ICSU council meeting, which is scheduled for 1986. A U.S. committee on IGBP has been formed by the National Research Council to develop the U.S. proposal to ICSU. The committee report emphasizes the importance of IGBP and I want to associate myself strongly with that statement. The committee and I believe that as IGBP proceeds, observation of the Earth from space will become an integral component of the program. We encourage NASA to continue its research and development activities to support IGBP and also to continue supporting the Earth Systems Science Advisory Committee and the National Research Council Committee on the International Geosphere/Biosphere Program.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Natural Resources, Agriculture Research and Environment, I intend to encourage NOAA to participate fully in this program.

Mr. Chairman, for all of the above reasons, I believe that this is a very good bill. It is forward looking and funds several important activities. I intend to support it and I urge my colleagues to do the same.



Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER].

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of our colleagues the committee's interest in second sourcing of the solid rocket booster propellant for the space shuttle.

The committee report to accompany H.R. 1714 includes language supporting NASA's investigation of a second source and encouraging the agency to determine whether such competition would produce significant savings in the Space Shuttle Program.

The administration has stressed repeatedly the value of competition as a mechanism to increase efficiency and reduce costs. Having reviewed this matter, I believe that the Solid Rocket Booster Program is an ideal candidate for implementing second sourcing. Hundreds of millions of dollars can be saved over the life of the Shuttle Program.

I eagerly anticipate NASA's report to the committee on this matter.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to voice my support of H.R. 1714, the NASA authorization bill covering fiscal year 1986. The programs outlined in this authorization will allow us to maintain a balanced research and development effort in space transportation, space science, space applications, aeronautics, and space technology.

Before continuing, let me compliment Chairman Fuqua and the distinguished ranking Republican member from New Mexico, Mr. LUJAN, for their hard work and effort in bringing this fine bill to the House floor.

I would also like to congratulate Hon. Mr. NELSON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications for his dedication and the firm hand he exercised in guiding the NASA bill through the hearings and markup process. The subcommittee minority, led by Mr. WALKER also displayed excellent team spirit in moving this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, my support of this bill comes with no reservations.

I am excited and pleased with the initial progress being made by NASA on the Space Station Program. The development of this multipurpose facility is essential to the future of this country's space science and space technology research programs. The scope of this project and the magnitude of the investment will require that NASA continue to exercise administrative vigilance through all phases of space station development to ensure that the ambitious objectives of this exciting program are achieved.

I am pleased with the inclusion of title II in the bill covering the pricing of shuttle services to commercial and foreign users for the 3-year period beginning October 1988. This title underscores the importance of our national goal to make the space transportation system available to commercial and foreign users at a price which encourages the full and effective use of space.

I also applaud NASA for its development of the Hitchhiker, Spartan, and Get Away Special shuttle payload programs. These programs will provide scientists with more flexibility, at a lower cost, to conduct serious scientific research in space.

I strongly support the continued authorization of funding for NASA's Technology Utilization Program. Although the size of this program is relatively small, its importance in accelerating the transfer and application of advanced aeronautics and space technologies cannot be overstated. It is my firm belief that we must continue to look for ways to shorten the time between the development of new space technologies and their infusion into the broader national economy.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend NASA for recent actions taken in the area of space commercialization. This year NASA's Office of Commercial Programs hopes to provide seed money for three to six centers for the commercial development of space. It is my feeling that these centers will play a critical role in assisting the scientific and research communities in moving new ideas through the basic research phase into the marketplace.

I am pleased to see this kind of government encouragement in response to the increasing level of interest shown by private industry and the capital markets in commercial space activities.

The aerospace industry is clearly one of this Nation's high tech winners in the world market arena. The importance of this industry in general, and the civil aircraft sector in particular, to the U.S. economy must not be overlooked as we make decisions about our future directions. The export of civil aircraft, engines and parts continue to make a positive contribution to our balance of trade that is second only to agriculture.

Of the approximately three quarters of a million employees in the industry, nearly one-third are engineers and scientists, the highest ratio for any manufacturing industry. As both a developer and user of new technologies, the aviation industry, when healthy is a catalyst for technological advancement across a broad sector of nonaerospace industries. While usually described by listing a relatively few large manufacturers, the industry is in fact the summation of over 15,000 firms located in at least 40 States that make

up the supplier base that is common for all aircraft development in the United States, both military and civilian.

The nationwide employment, the technical competence it represents, the major contributions to the GNP and the balance of trade and maybe most importantly, the self supporting industrial base for national defense use are all vital to the U.S. economy. These benefits all stem from the premier stature of our industry in world competition. A status that was achieved through the aggressive exploitation of new technology to provide superior products. A position that is now being eroded through the concerted efforts of foreign backed industries.

The continued health of the U.S. aeronautics industry is heavily dependent on the research and technology development conducted by NASA. As the technology level, the competition and the stakes in the world market grow, so does the importance of the NASA aeronautical research programs.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1714, the NASA fiscal year 1986 authorization bill. Programs within this authorization provide for continued research and development in space flight, space science, space applications, aeronautical and space research, and technology, and necessary supporting construction and administrative efforts.

Before continuing, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to Chairman Fuqua and the distinguished senior Republican member from New Mexico, Mr. LUJAN, for their leadership in producing this fine bill and bringing it to the floor.

I would also like to congratulate our Chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications, Mr. NELSON, for his hard work and dedication during the hearing and markup process. The support provided by the subcommittee minority, led by Mr. WALKER, also contributed significantly to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about why I support this bill with no reservations. The bill provides balanced support for the full spectrum of NASA's activities while observing the need for fiscal restraint.

I am particularly pleased with the funding level agreed to by the committee for the gravity probe-B experiment. This experiment is designed to test a particular effect predicted on Einstein's general theory of relativity and has received widespread support from the scientific community including endorsements from: the Presi-

dent's Scientific Advisor; several Nobel Prize scientists; various standing scientific advisory committees.

It is important to point out that the funding level recommended by the committee in fiscal year 1986 for the gravity probe-B experiment will enable NASA to conduct a test on the shuttle to determine if the delicate and expensive apparatus required for this experiment will work before committing funds to the full experiment.

I also strongly support the Hubble Space Telescope Program. The launch of this automated observatory in 1986 will improve our access to space for observation purposes by more than a hundredfold. In addition, this program will exercise the broad capabilities of the space transportation system for delivery, servicing, repair and retrieval of payloads from space. Finally, the contribution by the European Space Agency of certain space telescope hardware exemplifies the opportunities and benefits that accrue from including our international partners in space projects like the Hubble space telescope.

Mr. Chairman, I must make one final comment on the space station project. The space station initiative represents one of the most important decisions this country has ever made in space science and technology. Our decision to embark on the space station project today will enable us to achieve a permanent manned presence in space in the next decade. This investment will provide the capability to accelerate both our space science and applications programs as well as the commercial utilization of space. This investment is also consistent with our national objective of maintaining a leadership position in space science and technology.

Mr. Chairman I fully support this bill with no reservations and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for it.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1714 which authorizes appropriations for NASA for fiscal year 1986. The distinguished chairman of the committee, the Honorable DON FUQUA from Florida, has brought a strong bill to the floor and I want to commend him for his efforts and leadership on this matter of great importance.

I also want to recognize the dedicated efforts of the members of the Committee on Science and Technology and, in particular, the members of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications and its chairman, the Honorable BILL NELSON, for developing the bill before us today. The gentleman from Florida is to be congratulated for the leadership, patience, and legislative insight he has demonstrated in preparing this bill. I also want to

acknowledge and commend the senior Republican member of the subcommittee, the Honorable ROBERT WALKER, for his efforts and cooperation on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, NASA has achieved an unparalleled level of success over the years and has demonstrated, time and again, that it is among the finest and most competent organizations in this country and in the world. It has achieved this distinction as a result, in large part, of the strong support of the Congress. In this tradition, I urge all of my colleagues to support this excellent bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to say a few words about some of the programs that are authorized funding by this bill.

It is my view that H.R. 1714 strikes an excellent balance between the need to maintain an adequate level of funding for such manned programs as the space shuttle and space station, while at the same time providing a healthy level of support for space science initiatives.

One such group of space science initiatives which I believe are particularly important are those that relate to the International Geosphere/Biosphere Program [IGBP]. This proposed program is a coordinated international research effort aimed at understanding the Earth as a living planet, including the investigation of such phenomena as the El Nino, large volcanic emissions that are injected into the atmosphere, and the "greenhouse effect" that can be caused by increasing atmospheric levels of carbon dioxide from burning fossil fuels. Many NASA activities authorized within this bill will contribute to the IGBP research program. Flight missions include the upper atmosphere research satellite [UARS], the ocean topography experiment [TOPEX], the Navy research ocean satellite system [NROSS]—which is a Navy satellite with a NASA instrument—the geopotential research mission [GRM], and the ocean color imager [OCI]. Also, NASA's interdisciplinary research program and its Goddard Institute of Space Science will contribute substantially to the science base of IGBP.

Other NASA space science and aeronautics programs are also providing significant economic benefits and long-term productivity advances to the Nation as a whole. Many direct advances in communication satellites, improved aircraft—including more energy efficient aircraft—remote sensing satellites, and other innovations have both improved the productive capacity of industry and stimulated the development and growth of many new businesses. Indirectly, through the development and dissemination of advanced technologies to U.S. firms, the spinoffs from the space and aeronau-

tics programs have been applied in virtually every sector of the economy.

In the manned spaceflight arena, H.R. 1714 authorizes NASA to continue its efforts to conduct preliminary design and focused technology expansion in support of the development of a permanent manned space station. This station will add a whole new dimension in the ability of the United States to conduct space science research, in-space manufacturing, and on-orbit support of space-based assets. I believe that NASA is approaching this program in a logical, straightforward manner. In this regard, it is clear that a substantial amount of work remains to be done. For example, two new technologies that need to be developed to permit long-term economical operation of a permanently manned space station are: First, a closed; that is, regenerative, or partially closed life support system for the air and water used on the station; and second, a solar dynamic system that uses the heat from the Sun to make electrical power—rather than relying on less efficient solar cells which use sunlight to make electricity. Important technology development efforts such as these will be undertaken with the funding provided in this bill.

NASA is also devoting a substantial amount of time and attention to increasing the cost efficiency of the backbone of America's space program, the space shuttle. This includes efforts to increase the number of flights that can be completed by a fixed, or even reduced, level of manpower, as well as measures to directly reduce the cost of component parts. In the latter area, NASA is taking such measures as: First, encouraging contractors to set increased "learning curve" goals to reduce unit production costs; and second, conducting extensive research efforts to increase the operational lifetime of individual components such as engine turbo pumps. As more fully discussed in the report that accompanies this bill, I would also like to commend NASA for its current study of the potential for competitive procurement of solid rocket motors from a second production source to reduce space shuttle operating costs. The programs contained within this bill will continue to place emphasis on reducing space shuttle operating costs.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I believe H.R. 1714 is a balanced and well formulated bill that will authorize programs which can provide substantial future benefits to the United States. Accordingly, I strongly recommend that this bill be overwhelmingly adopted.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1714.



An examination of the cooperative efforts between NASA and the Federal Aviation Administration reveals that although the charters of both agencies are very broad, the mutually supportive roles of those agencies have been well defined and should be clear to those who have an interest for budget or executive direction purposes. FAA has the responsibility to provide for the safe and efficient use of the Nation's airspace and for research and development in the air traffic and airways facilities area. This is being carried out aggressively in the development of a revitalized system described in the FAA national airspace plan. On the other hand, the FAA relies almost exclusively on NASA for conducting long term aeronautical research and technology development programs. NASA's programs provide a data base to the FAA for the better understanding to meet Government responsibilities regarding airworthiness certification, including structural concepts and materials, advanced aerodynamics, propulsion, controls and aircraft operating systems.

Under well-defined formal interagency agreements, NASA and FAA cooperative activities take advantage of the unique facilities and expertise at NASA to carry out research using applications and safety perspectives guidance provided by the FAA. An example of these types of activities are exemplified in the recently conducted full-scale transport controlled impact demonstration. The subject of the NASA-FAA cooperative activities cover the entire spectrum of the aeronautical disciplines and are continually changing as projects are completed and new ones addressing different problems are added. The number of outstanding activities reach over 50. There does exist a close relationship between NASA and FAA in safety-related research that helps assure that the Nation gets an efficient, well-focused program in this important area.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we put things in perspective. Although we are calling for a \$375 million increase in authorization over last year, I would say that that is a modest request. Keep in mind that we are at the same time standing idly by when the excise tax on cigarettes is going to be reduced 50 percent come October 1, from 16 cents a pack to 8 cents a pack. Every 1 penny in excise tax on cigarettes brings in \$212 million. Now, if we just stopped that action, we will have \$1.6 billion to deal with, pay for the increased authorization here, and have a billion and some change left over. Let's do it.

□ 1720

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to compliment my subcommittee chairman, Mr. NELSON, and my full committee chairman, Mr. FUQUA, for their strong leadership in keeping this authorization bill within the constraints of the President's request. We have made some modest changes in priorities, but the overall totals remain identical.

One of the major issues that has been addressed in this bill is that of shuttle pricing. This was a thorny issue, but the subcommittee held 2 days of hearings on the subject, heard from all interested parties, and made a decision based on input from these hearings as well as a number of private discussions. I believe that we have achieved the best balance in the price that has been determined for the 1989-91 timeframe that we can with all of the variables that had to be considered.

The space station is an exciting program that is backed by both the administration and the committee. We have authorized \$230 million in this authorization bill to complete the preliminary design and technology expansion effort. This month NASA will award its first contracts for the design of this permanent space station. The space station will be the natural follow-on to the Shuttle Program and will not only be an exciting new phase for the United States, but will be a new challenge that will enable us to have a new level of capability in space.

The space station will serve as a docking facility for space vehicles such as the space shuttle as well as a permanent facility in space for scientific, technological, and commercial purposes. The upcoming phase B preliminary design for the space station is critical in order that all of the potential users can be accommodated. It will provide us with the confidence that the needed elements for the station can be produced within cost and schedule requirements.

In my own congressional district, the Johnson Space Center is the lead NASA center for the overall architecture and assembly structure, all of the integration of utilities, the docking structure, and other module outfitting. All of the NASA centers are involved in the definition and design of the space station. This is an exciting era for NASA. This is an exciting era for the United States and our international partners. New doors are opening and new concepts are emerging.

This authorization is a modest beginning for this exciting new era. With the budget constraints that we are

facing, this bill is a masterful balance of our priorities—we cannot have everything that we would like, but we have chosen our priorities carefully.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, there remain few programs in America as promising and important as our space program. I rise in strong support of H.R. 1714, the 1986 NASA budget authorization bill. As our Nation continues to demonstrate its leadership role in space exploration and development—and in the absence of an overall budget freeze—Congress should support a modest but necessary 5-percent increase in funding for NASA's program activities. I hope that the NASA budget increases for the last several years signals a new era of expansion in our nation's civilian space program.

Mr. Chairman, last year I supported and voted for an overall budget freeze. That could well be a good program for fiscal year 1986. But, in the absence of an overall freeze, NASA is hardly the place to cut. I am particularly enthusiastic about NASA's commitment to development of a permanently manned space station. Given the current rate at which Congress is funding design and research for the space station, it should be ready for operation in the early 1990's. Once deployed, the space station will promote a new generation of space travel, commercialization and cooperation.

A permanent manned space station will enable crew members to react instantly to data and observations, allowing them to make full and flexible use of a zero gravity laboratory environment. In such an environment we can look forward to producing new high purity drugs and crystals for advanced computer chips. Without a permanent or at least long-term presence in space, we cannot conduct biological testing on the effects of zero gravity on humans, and thus hope to undertake long-term manned missions in the future. The space station provides real hope to expansion of opportunities for our disabled citizens.

The space station represents all of the best elements in our civilian space program. In addition to allowing for greater space commercialization, the space station has generated an unprecedented opportunity for international cooperation. I hope that NASA will continue to work with Japan, Canada, and the European Space Agency in developing and financing space station components, reiterating our Nation's commitment to cooperating with other space faring-nations for peaceful purposes and promoting greater cost effectiveness in our own space program.

I would also like to remind my colleagues that as demand for use of our space shuttle increases every year, we should endorse the Science and Technology Committee's budget request, which provides \$45 million more for shuttle structural spares than requested by the administration. In order for this Nation to carry out its civil and commercial space missions and space station activities, it should invest in a fifth shuttle orbiter. I would call my colleagues' attention to the committee report which states if the United States does not soon decide to build an additional orbiter, "the production base may have declined to such an extent that the country will no longer be able to build the vehicle for a reasonable amount of money."

The NASA Space Program has never failed to provide the public with continuous exposure to wondrous and useful scientific discoveries. Now that space is becoming more familiar and accessible, we must reassert our interest in exploring its endless boundaries. I would suggest that strong support for this bill will speak loudly for pursuing that goal.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation which first authorized the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration directed NASA to achieve the broadest possible dissemination of the technology developed for space exploration. To help accomplish this directive, NASA has established its Technology Utilization Program, with Industrial Applications Centers located around the country to access NASA technology and put it into the hands of nonspace-related business and industry.

As a former member of the Space Science Subcommittee, I supported and encouraged NASA's IAC's and its Technology Utilization Program. But the more I studied, I began to realize that, despite all its good intentions, NASA was discriminating against rural America.

That is why several years ago, as a member of the Science and Technology Committee, I worked with the Space Science Subcommittee to direct NASA to establish a Rural Applications Team. This Rural Applications Team, which has been funded at only \$140,000 the past 2 years, is working to not only identify the problems in rural America, but initiate the use of technology to solve rural economic and industrial problems. This program, which has only been in existence a few short years, is beginning to reap success.

That is why I am encouraged, Mr. Chairman, to see that the administra-

tion has sought, and this committee has authorized, an additional \$1.6 million for the TU Program. I would like to ask the chairman and members of this committee to make sure that rural America, through the Rural Applications Team, receives its fair share and appropriate increase. I would also like to work with you in the near future to see what opportunity exists to make the Rural Applications Team a part of legislative language.

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1714, the NASA authorization for fiscal year 1986, and to congratulate the committee for its work on the bill.

We have here an exceptional piece of legislation—an authorization bill for a major agency which is virtually identical, at least in price, to the President's request.

It's an excellent bill. It authorizes a level of funding for the space shuttle which allows the program to continue at a pace tailored to its mission and capabilities. And it allows for future expansion of those capabilities via a fifth orbiter by keeping the production line intact. The Shuttle Program is now entering its most productive years. In 1986, the second shuttle spacecraft will begin operations at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California, providing the Shuttle Program with a polar orbital capability for the first time and opening new possibilities for Earth research and national security.

The bill also continues the Space Station Program initiated last year, moving into phase B of the program—the development of detailed definition and design. The space station is inextricably linked to the space shuttle, and its deployment in the next decade will bring us to a new frontier of knowledge and capability in space.

For the first time, this Nation will have a year-round presence in space, and a staging station for future voyages beyond near space. The benefits—technological, scientific, medical, and industrial, as well as in national security—are bound to be even more numerous than we can foresee today.

Finally, the bill provides a reasonable level of funding for research and development in physics and astronomy, planetary exploration, life sciences, space applications, technology and other fields which have kept us on the cutting edge of science, technology, and economic development here on Earth.

It's truly an outstanding result of the efforts of all involved, and I urge an "aye" vote.●

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate my committee chairman, Mr. FUQUA, and my subcommittee chairman, Mr. NELSON, for the masterful job that they have done to keep this authorization bill within the budget constraints of the administration request. Although we have

changed some of the priorities, this is a good bill and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

We are entering a new era for NASA. As the Shuttle Program is shifting from research and development into operations, the commercial potential will begin to be realized. With this in mind, an Office of Commercial Programs was established in NASA last year to support new commercial high technology ventures. The office is also responsible for the support of new commercial applications of existing technology and the transfer of existing space programs to the private sector.

This authorizing legislation increases the funding for the commercial use of space from the current level of \$8.5 million to \$20 million—about a 235-percent increase—for fiscal year 1986. Although this is \$10 million less than NASA requested, the subcommittee felt that the funding recommended was more than adequate considering the maturity of the program.

As we are able to increase industry investment and participation in high technology, the position of the United States can only be enhanced worldwide. Several efforts were begun in this fiscal year that will be carried on and expanded in fiscal year 1986. Centers for the Commercial Development of Space were established; NASA facilities and equipment were made more readily available for private use; and joint NASA and private sector research for commercial applications were stimulated.

Last year, NASA Administrator Jim Beggs stated, in a speech to a Syracuse University audience—

In the remaining 16 years of this century, there is no question that space will be the arena for expanding commercial activity in many areas, including communications satellites, launch vehicles and launch services, upper stage systems, industrial and scientific experimentations and manufacturing.

The efforts being put forth by NASA are designed to encourage significant private investments in commercial enterprises that take advantage of the unique characteristics of space, such as vacuum, microgravity, and radiation.

The Commercial Space Launch Act which was passed in the last Congress also established an Office of Commercial Space in the Department of Transportation. This office was set up to help private companies cut through the Federal redtape and to expedite the commercial use of space. Recently, this office granted its first license to a private company and is well on its way to opening these new frontiers to the private sector.

We offer a very balanced bill here today. Although there are modest changes in priorities from those requested by the administration and NASA, we are still at the same bottom



line. I would like to urge my colleagues to support this carefully constructed authorization bill.●

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule by titles, and each title shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section I.

The text of section I is as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1986".

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

#### TITLE I—NASA AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 101. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to become available October 1, 1985:

(a) For "Research and development," for the following programs:

- (1) Space station, \$230,000,000;
- (2) Space transportation capability development, \$444,300,000;
- (3) Physics and astronomy, \$637,400,000;
- (4) Life sciences, \$72,000,000;
- (5) Planetary exploration, \$359,000,000;
- (6) Space applications, \$550,800,000;
- (7) Technology utilization, \$11,100,000;
- (8) Commercial use of space, \$20,000,000;
- (9) Aeronautical research and technology, \$354,000,000;
- (10) Space research and technology, \$168,000,000;
- (11) Tracking and data advanced systems, \$16,200,000.

(b) For "Space flight, control and data communications," for the following programs:

- (1) Space shuttle production and operational capability, \$1,011,500,000;
- (2) Space transportation operations, \$1,715,100,000;
- (3) Space and ground network, communications and data systems, \$803,300,000.

(c) For "Construction of facilities," including land acquisition, as follows:

(1) Space transportation facilities at various locations as follows:

(A) Construction of orbiter modification and refurbishment facility, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$14,000,000;

(B) Construction of thermal protection system facility, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$3,600,000;

(C) Modifications for advanced technology engine test stand S-1C, George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, \$6,500,000;

(D) Modification for enhanced life support systems testing, Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center, \$1,100,000;

(E) Modifications to Pad A payload changeout room, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$2,200,000;

(F) Modifications to space shuttle main engine support systems, National Space Technology Laboratories, \$2,500,000;

(2) Space shuttle payload facilities at various locations as follows:

(A) Construction of payload control rooms, John F. Kennedy Space Center, \$1,200,000;

(B) Construction of spacecraft systems development and integration facility, Goddard Space Flight Center, \$8,000,000;

(3) Construction of additions to research projects laboratory, Goddard Space Flight Center, \$3,800,000;

(4) Construction of microdevices laboratory, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, \$8,900,000;

(5) Construction of numerical aerodynamic simulation facility, Ames Research Center, \$8,200,000;

(6) Modifications to the sixteen-foot transonic tunnel for improved productivity and research capability, Langley Research Center, \$4,900,000;

(7) Modification of 64-meter antenna, DSS-14, Goldstone, California, \$8,500,000;

(8) Modification of 64-meter antenna, DSS-43, Canberra, Australia, \$8,900,000;

(9) Repair of facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$750,000 per project, \$22,000,000;

(10) Rehabilitation and modification of facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$750,000 per project, \$27,000,000;

(11) Minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities at various locations, not in excess of \$500,000 per project, \$6,000,000; and

(12) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, \$12,000,000.

Notwithstanding paragraph (1) through (12) of this subsection, the total amount authorized by this subsection shall not exceed \$148,300,000.

(d) For "Research and program management," \$1,345,000,000.

(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 101(h), appropriations hereby authorized for "Research and development" and "Space flight, control and data communications" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required at locations other than installations of the Administration for the performance of research and development contracts, and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to ensure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" and "Space flight, control and data communications" pursuant to this Act may be used in accordance with this subsection for the construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds \$500,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(f) When so specified and to the extent provided in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development," for "Space flight, control and data communications" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the

"Research and program management" appropriation for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

(g) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 101(d) may be used, but not to exceed \$35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(h) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsections 101(a), 101(b), and 101(d), not in excess of \$100,000 for each project, including collateral equipment, may be used for construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and for repair, rehabilitation, or modification of facilities: *Provided*, That, of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 101(a) or 101(b), not in excess of \$500,000 for each project, including collateral equipment, may be used for any of the foregoing for unforeseen programmatic needs.

Sec. 102. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1) through (11), inclusive, of subsection 101(c)—

(1) in the discretion of the Administrator or his designee, may be varied upward 10 per centum, or

(2) following a report by the Administrator or his designee to the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the circumstances of such action, may be varied upward 25 per centum, to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed the total of the amounts specified in such paragraphs.

Sec. 103. Not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 101(a) or 101(b) hereof may be transferred to and merged with the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and, when so transferred, together with \$10,000,000 of funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 101(c) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (12) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, and modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 101(c)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations unless a period of thirty days has passed after the administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the

nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (ii) the cost thereof including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (iii) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest.

Sec. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Technology or the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation,

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by subsections 101 (a), (b), and (d), and

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to either such committee,

unless a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action.

Sec. 105. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

Sec. 106. Hereafter, the Inspector General of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is authorized to administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation or affidavit, whenever necessary in the performance of the functions assigned by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, 5 U.S.C. App., which oath, affirmation, or affidavit, when administered or taken by or before an investigator or such other employee of the Office of Inspector General designated by the Inspector General shall have the same force and effect as if administered or taken by or before an officer having a seal.

Sec. 107. Title III of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of section 305 the following new subsection:

"(m) Any invention made or used in outer space on a space vehicle (including satellites, platforms, and other orbiting vehicles, manned or unmanned, together with related equipment, devices, components and parts) under the jurisdiction or control of the United States shall be considered made or used in the United States for the purposes of title 35, United States Code. This subsection shall not apply to any process, machine, article of manufacture or composition of matter, an embodiment of which was first made or used in outer space prior to the effective date of this Act."

Sec. 108. The authorization for space shuttle production and operational capability includes provisions for the production activities necessary to provide for a fleet of four space shuttle orbiters, including the production of structural and component spares, necessary to ensure confident and cost effective operation of the four orbiter fleet as well as provisions for maintaining

production readiness (particularly critical skills needed for production and installation of electrical, mechanical, and fluid systems) for a fifth orbiter vehicle.

Sec. 109. Title II of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1985, is amended as follows: In section 204(c), change "twelve months" to "eighteen months".

Sec. 110. Within ninety days of the enactment of this Act the Administrator shall review those recommendations of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control and shall submit a report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate on the implementation status of each such recommendations which affects the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and which are within the authority and control of the Administrator.

Sec. 111. The Administrator shall initiate an immediate feasibility study and such planning efforts as may be necessary to ensure a timely flight opportunity for a physically disabled American.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the first committee amendment.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc, considered as read, and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the committee amendments is as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 11, strike line 7 through 19.

Page 11, line 20, strike "108" and insert "107".

Page 12, line 4, strike "109" and insert "108".

Page 12, line 8, strike "110" and insert "109".

Page 12, line 11, after "control" insert "and such other recommendations as may be included in the OMB report 'Management of the United States Government—1986'."

Page 12, line 21, strike "111" and insert "110".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, just to briefly explain the amendments.

These two amendments reflect action that was taken in the full committee. The first amendment, deletes provisions in section 107 relating to patent rights in outer space. We found that we needed more time to study this issue and work with the Judiciary Committee in resolving matters that related to patent rights. We decided to delete that until another time, and bring it up in another bill.

Section 109 adds further language. The bill includes language relating to the Grace Commission recommendations. We expand that language to include the recommendations of the

General Accounting Office and the Office of Management and Budget and other reports that have been made for cost effectiveness in Government. They are two good amendments, and were approved unanimously in the committee. I urge their adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MEYERS OF KANSAS

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas: Page 3, line 4, strike out "\$1,011,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$976,500,000".

Page 2, line 13, strike out "\$444,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$459,300,000".

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear that I do support H.R. 1714; that I think the chairman and the ranking member of the committee do an excellent job, and that the subcommittee chairman and ranking subcommittee member do an outstanding job.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to title I of H.R. 1714, the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1986.

What this amendment does is really very simple: it takes the \$45 million added to the structural spares program by the committee and redistributes the bulk of it to other important programs which were cut by the committee. It also saves the taxpayer a full \$20 million, by achieving a net reduction in the total authorization for NASA. In no way will this amendment hurt our Space Shuttle Program.

This amendment, has the full support of the administration, NASA, and of many member of the subcommittee.

I have 435 copies of a "Statement of Administration Policy" at the desk for my colleagues.

Let me take a moment to tell you what this amendment will not do.

This amendment will not cancel our option to have a fifth orbiter, should the need arise. It will not shut down the production lines for structural spare parts for the space shuttle. It will not hurt the U.S. Space Program one bit; in fact, this amendment will make the program stronger by restoring some cuts in the Shuttle Program made by the committee.

As you may know, there are two kinds of spare parts programs in the NASA budget: In one program are the funds used to buy spare parts in case we need them to repair existing orbiters, and in the other are the funds used to buy structural spare parts for repair and to preserve the option to buy a fifth shuttle orbiter. To date, NASA's Administrator has said he foresees no immediate need for a fifth



orbiter. In fact, there is great concern that, if anything, the demand in the next 10 years for launches will decrease, rather than increase.

In this bill we already have \$100 million for spare parts for the shuttle in case repairs are needed; we also already have a total of \$120 million for structural spare parts in case of accident we decide that we need a fifth orbiter.

My amendment does not concern either of these two sums. My amendment will leave the \$220 million for spare parts for the orbiter intact.

What my amendment does do, however, is to take out the extra \$45 million that the committee added to the existing \$220 million for spare parts. What this amendment does is to take that extra money and put it back in places that the committee got it from in the first place when it shuffled funds around in the NASA budget request.

It is not as if my proposed amendment runs contrary to the will of all the members of the House Science and Technology Committee. This amendment was suggested at subcommittee level and offered at full committee level. The debate was heated and the vote was fairly close. I believe that this issue is important enough to be brought to the attention of the full House.

I have at the desk 435 copies of a letter written to me by Mr. Jim Beggs, the current Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In his letter, the NASA Administrator makes it quite clear that he does not want—nor does he need—the \$45 million added to the structural spares program by the committee. In his words, he would prefer it if we restored some of the funding for the other space shuttle programs that the committee cut when it marked up the NASA bill.

All of us know that times are tough and money is tight. I believe that it is critically important that when we spend money, we spend it in the most efficient way possible. And, that is why I have proposed this amendment.

Let me take a moment to lay out the facts of the case.

Fact: According to the Administrator of NASA himself, the additional \$45 million is not required for spare parts. If you doubt my words, please get a copy of the letter at the desk.

Fact: This amendment does not kill the fifth orbiter should we decide that we need one: there is already \$120 million in the budget to keep that option open.

Fact: The additional \$45 million is not necessary to keep the production lines open at the Palmdale, CA, plant. Passage of my amendment will not cause us to lose employees with expertise in shuttle production. Employees involved in this aspect of the Shuttle

Program will continue to work on other defense contracts critical to our Nation's security. Should we need a fifth orbiter, we will have the experienced people to build it.

Fact: The Downey, CA, production line will remain open and structural spares will be produced and stored there. These parts can be used in case of accident or to prepare for assembly of an eventual fifth, should the need for a fifth orbiter arise in the future.

Fact: According to Administrator Jim Beggs himself, "there is no demonstrable need for a fifth orbiter."

Fact: According to Administrator Beggs, should the need for a fifth orbiter arise, NASA would make a substantial funding request to Congress to fund the fifth. In the words of Mr. Beggs himself, "Even if we did need a fifth, the \$45 million in structural spares added by the committee wouldn't make much of a difference."

Mr. Chairman, my point is a very simple one: we cannot afford to spend hard-earned taxpayer dollars on unnecessary programs.

This amendment would take \$25 million from the \$45 million that was added and distribute it the following way: \$10 million to restore funds that were cut in the Space Shuttle Program and operations capability line item and \$15 million would go back into the space transportation capability and development item. These items carry with them a higher priority and certainly deserve to be in this budget. We would under this amendment, achieve an overall budget reduction of \$20 million.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be very sure that my amendment is not misinterpreted as an antishuttle amendment or as an antispace amendment. I lend my wholehearted support to the Space Program. I know that an investment in space and space-related technologies is one of the soundest economic investments that we can make. Current figures indicate that for every \$1 invested, we get a return of anywhere from \$7 to \$14. The Space Program is good for our economy and good for our Nation as a whole.

The \$45 million in question, however, is not.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge that my colleagues support my amendment. My amendment has broad, bipartisan support and will do the Space Program good—in the long run and in the short run. I urge my colleagues to support me in my effort to pass a fiscally responsible bill.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I include the text of the letter to me from Mr. Beggs for insertion in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, DC, April 1, 1985.

HON. JAN MEYERS,  
House of Representatives  
Washington, DC.

DEAR Ms. MEYERS: NASA proposed the Structural Spares Program for the Shuttle Program in FY 84; there was, however, a small relative amount spent for the program in 1983. In the FY 1985 budget, Congress added \$40M to our \$120M requested, and the Space Science and Technology Committee has proposed another \$45M to the \$120M requested in FY 1986, which raised the all year total of \$460M to \$505M. We believe the additional \$45M is not required to complete the program and would prefer that the funds remain in the accounts as they were originally proposed.

It should be further noted that we will be spending several hundred million over the next several years purchasing the operational spares for the shuttle.

We would be distressed if additional monies were allotted to the Space Science budget in FY86 since our budget request for the Space Science and Applications received the largest increase of any budget segment within NASA.

I hope this clarifies the Agency position on these important appropriation issues.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. BEGGS,  
Administrator.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MEYERS OF KANSAS

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas: On page 5, line 17, strike "1,345,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,300,000,000".

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent from the letter that the gentleman from Kansas has read that the NASA administration, the Administrator, feels as though \$45 million can be saved in this budget. OMB has brought forth a position which indicates that \$45 million can be saved.

The issue here is whether or not you want to save the money by taking it out of any chance we have of having a fifth orbiter, or whether you want to take it out of the hides of bureaucrats. What my amendment says is: Let us save the whole \$45 million but let us eliminate bureaucrats. Let us save the option of the fifth orbiter and let us cut some bureaucrats.

It seems to me that is a better option. It seems to me that what we have here is an opportunity to save the option for the fifth orbiter. We think it is extremely important, having studied this matter for the last several years, that preserving the option for the fifth orbiter is very, very important if you look toward the future of the space station. So, therefore, what my amendment does is, it

says let us keep that in place but take the money out of administration at NASA.

The difference between my amendment and the amendment offered by the gentlewoman is that she saves a total of \$20 million, and this amendment saves the whole \$45 million. The total \$45 million in savings would be in this amendment; whereas, there would only be an actual savings of \$20 million in her amendment because she programmed some money the other way.

So I would hope the committee, knowing that NASA and OMB feel that we can save \$45 million, will preserve our option here of keeping the fifth orbiter, but will do it by having us take it out of administration rather than away from the Shuttle Program.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the gentleman has shared the amendment with us. We have discussed it and I am prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment in light of events. I think it is a good amendment in this particular case.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let us not move so fast in accepting that amendment. I do not want it to just go on unanswered.

What the gentlewoman has proposed is that we take the \$45 million out. The reason she has said that is because she has been told by NASA, in writing, that that is all right; that the \$45 million can be done away with. But what she has done that is not being done by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his amendment is she is taking the money that was cut to arrive at that \$45 million in some of those programs, and those were launch and mission support, systems upgrading which reduces the weight and makes more efficient the system, which is exactly what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is talking about, those are the things that we want to move on ahead with.

The \$5 million for space lab she is putting back in. Payload operations support equipment, the tethered satellite. Those are all very desirable things that the subcommittee cut in order to be able to put the \$45 million on the spare parts for the shuttle.

That is really not quite fair. You want your cake and you want to eat it, too. You want to keep the \$45 million there. You want to reduce those programs that you did not particularly

like. And it is always very popular to attack a bureaucrat and say, "Hey, let us take it out of there." Let us take both of them out if that is what the gentleman wants to do. But I think the gentlewoman has some logic in saying let us take it from the add-ons and put it back to the deductions that the subcommittee made.

So I do not want to leave with the impression that everybody has agreed to what the gentleman is doing. Let me just quote, if I may, from a letter from NASA which says:

We believe the additional \$45 million is not required to complete the program and would prefer that the funds remain in the accounts as they were originally proposed.

This is the Administrator from NASA saying that. We would like them in those places where they were originally proposed. The gentlewoman from Kansas is saying exactly that. We are not going to give you everything.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I would continue to yield to the gentleman from New Mexico. I would like to be able to reply to the gentleman.

Mr. LUJAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding further to me.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what the gentlewoman is doing. She is complying with what the NASA policy is.

Furthermore, the letter from the Administrator of NASA goes on to say:

It should be further noted that we will be spending several hundred million dollars over the next several years purchasing the operational spares for the shuttle.

□ 1740

What he is saying is that we have \$220 million now, and we will be spending several hundred million later on. Give us the money back for some of those programs that we think are important.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's point. The gentleman is in fact defending the NASA position over the congressional position, and that is perfectly appropriate. That is what the gentlewoman from Kansas has brought to the floor.

It is my contention that we in the Congress also have some ability to determine the priorities in this budget. That is exactly what we have done. We feel strongly that it is important to have the option of the fifth orbiter. I would contend the gentlewoman's amendment is well intentioned, but it does in fact cancel out the option of this orbiter. If we do so, we are doing it knowingly, and I do not think that is the direction in which we ought to proceed.

I think it is extremely important to retain that option. I think it is important enough to retain that option that I am willing to rearrange priorities within NASA in such a way that we eliminate bureaucratic overhead in favor of keeping the option of the fifth orbiter. That is precisely what my amendment will do. I think it makes some sense, then, to go in that particular direction rather than to do as the gentlewoman has proposed, save the money by going back to the OMB-NASA priorities that came to our committee.

That is really all my amendment seeks to do, and it ends up saving us in fact more money than what is in the gentlewoman's amendment. It seems to me that that in itself, since the argument was made that we ought to be fiscally prudent here on the floor, says to us, "OK, take the option that saves the most money." That is the fiscally prudent thing to do.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Kansas.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, as much respect as I have for the ranking member of the Space Subcommittee, I do think that this amendment is somewhat destructive. I do not think that we should take \$45 million from administrative salaries. I think there is some unhappiness with NASA over the position because I know there are two strongly held beliefs here—well, there actually is one strongly held belief, and that is that should we need the fifth orbiter, we would have it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I continue to yield to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the argument is that should we need the fifth orbiter, it will be there. Mr. Beggs wants that, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] wants that, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] wants that. The way we are going to get there is what is different, and Mr. Beggs is saying that when they need a fifth orbiter, they will request \$200 million or \$300 million a year over a 2-year or 3-year period because it is an enormously expensive project, and that setting aside \$45 million in spare parts will not accomplish the goal. I think that is clearly where the difference in thinking is.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentlewoman that when you cancel out the \$45 million at the front end of the production lines, you



in fact cancel out that option. At that point, yes, it would be \$200 million or \$300 million, but as a matter of fact later it would be \$500 million or \$600 million because you are going to have to recreate the production lines that will be lost as a result of this particular amendment.

The gentlewoman is correct that some of the production lines stay open. The problem is that we are now in the process of shutting off the front end of those production lines and moving down the stream. It is the front end of the lines that the \$45 million will preserve. The loss of the \$45 million will assure that those will be shut down and will have to be recreated, and that would make the fifth orbiter infinitely more expensive. It ends up being a penny-wise, pound-foolish kind of approach if we really do think we will have to go to a fifth orbiter because it will assure that that fifth orbiter will cost us infinitely more money in the end.

We think it is important to preserve the option of a cost-effective fifth orbiter, and that is precisely what my amendment would achieve. It would leave the \$45 million in place that has the cost-effectiveness in the fifth orbiter as its main mission, and it will take the money out of administrative costs.

I would remind the gentlewoman that there is over \$1.3 billion there in administrative costs, so it seems to me that that may be the place where we could achieve some of these savings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and in support of the original amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

The issue before us has been very well explained by the gentlewoman from Kansas. What the subcommittee did—and it was, of course, a bipartisan action—was to add \$45 million, which had the net effect, at least in the eyes of the supporters of the action, of continuing the option for a fifth orbiter for another few months.

There are many of us who have supported the shuttle for a long time and who supported not only a fifth, but a sixth, and a seventh orbiter, at some time in the past. We now know that so many orbiters are unnecessary, but we want to keep our options to make mistakes open as long as possible, and that is what this amounts to.

There is a parallel situation to this, and I hate to bring it up, but it is the zeal with which the Congress retained its option to build the Clinch River breeder reactor years after the economic justification for it had passed. So we should confront this head-on.

There is no economic justification for the fifth orbiter.

Since we began the process of determining what the manifest would be out into the next 10 years, we have progressively reduced the prospective loads on the shuttle orbiters. We had originally hoped it would take seven to carry all these loads, and we had in mind a huge number of communications satellites, with all of the Defense Department loads which we could imagine and all the great scientific projects we were going to do.

And what has happened? The Defense Department has received permission to use expendable launch vehicles. That wiped out 10 percent of the load. ARIANE has come in with a cheaper launch for communications satellites. They took 50 percent of that load last year. The budget for new science starts has been drastically slashed. We do not have the number of new science starts. We are going to be building shuttles, if we go to the fifth orbiter, to park them in a garage out in California and use them as part of a museum or something. I do not think that is what we ought to be doing in these times of budgetary austerity which some of my friends delight in talking about so much.

Therefore, I think the sensible thing to do is to adopt the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] and reject the obvious amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania which was leaped on with great alacrity by the chairman of the committee because he hopes it would forestall an even deeper cut later on. That is not the way we ought to play games here on the floor of the House.

Let us vote the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas up or down on its merits. I happen to think it is extremely meritorious. I am a cosponsor of it, as a matter of fact, and supported it in the full committee. We should face the reality of the fact that the direction we are moving in has removed the need for the fifth orbiter, and let us save that \$45 million.

I think that the administrator, Mr. Beggs, has been overly generous in putting \$220 million in this budget to protect the assembly line for spare parts and for structural spares. We are not going to need most of those and we will probably save some money there if we do not insist on loading this bill up with extra amounts like \$45 million. I think the administrator probably will cut some money out of these accounts. Of course, it is my hope that he will put it in some of the programs I have mentioned, the science programs and the solar exploration program and some of the others. He may not want to do that. But let us realistically face this political choice. If we do, it will be one of the few times we do realistically face anything

around here. We should vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and adopt the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mr. MONSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this bill came out of committee without adding to the anticipated deficits from the administration's budget. Those who have worked so diligently deserve a lot of credit for this.

Almost daily, additions are made to spending proposals that would go a few million dollars beyond our anticipated deficit here, and a few million dollars there, soon adding to billions. Not only has this committee not added further to this problem, but it has taken steps to help in stimulating a study of ways in which spending might be reduced in the future.

Looking into the possibility of more competition and providing needed elements of space exploration is one example. The inspiration to America, the economic stimulus that new technology brings and the educational opportunities that are developed, all persuade me that this is a good investment of our tax dollars.

Too often in the past we have seen America take the lead only to see other nations capitalize on our development because we do not follow through on our commitment.

The substitute amendment accomplishes a reduction without causing us to put in jeopardy a program we are not ready to make a decision on. An accented possibility or the future space station needs both argue for the need to keep open a fifth orbiter option until we have the information required to make such a decision. If keeping this option open would add further to our anticipated deficits, I would be the first to oppose it.

What this substitute amendment does is saves us the \$45 million in question, preserves the prerogatives of Congress to determine priorities for our agencies and allows us to keep open an option that is vital to our space program.

Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment being offered by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

I would say that this amendment, I had the opportunity to offer this amendment in the committee. As Mrs. MEYERS had already indicated, it was a heated debate, but I will say that afterward the overwhelming majority

of the Members there indicated that they felt we were in the right.

I think it is important that we reiterate the fact that this is an effort to direct our energies toward fiscal restraint, toward making major measures or major steps toward reducing the deficit and the fact that Mr. Beggs and the administration is not enthused about spending this money this year, I see that this is a reasonable, commonsense approach, toward using our money most wisely for this program.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for the 4 years prior to the start of the current Congress I had the honor to serve as a member of the Science and Technology Committee and its Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications. During those 4 years I have attended numerous hearings at which the need for a fifth orbiter and viable structural spares program were thoroughly debated.

As a result of those extensive hearings, I have become fairly knowledgeable on these issues and have strongly supported the past and present initiatives of the committee to ensure that this Nation maintains a viable option to build a fifth orbiter.

Mr. Chairman, this country has devoted a lot of time and resources to developing a reusable space launch vehicle that is unparalleled anywhere in the world. This vehicle, especially when used in conjunction with the space station, will usher in a whole new era of living and working in space. Indeed, with the space shuttle we will be able to service and repair malfunctioning satellites that are in orbit, manufacture exciting new drugs and materials that cannot be produced on the Earth, and provide a more economical access to space for Government, civilian, and foreign payloads.

However, Mr. Chairman, if the full potential of the space shuttle is to be realized, the size of the orbiter fleet will have to be adequate to service the demands that will arise over the next two decades.

Originally, the Orbiter fleet was to have comprised seven vehicles. Later, this was scaled back to five and then, during the Carter administration, to four. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that a fleet of only four Orbiters will not be sufficient to provide the flexibility and degree of access to space that this country will need in the future.

The administration is now in the process of deciding whether or not it believes a fifth space shuttle Orbiter is required. It is my strong belief that if the Congress does not supply this funding augmentation to the structural spares budget, then the option to

build a fifth orbiter at an affordable price will no longer be available.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I believe that this \$45 million funding augmentation is prudent and necessary. To not provide these funds would be shortsighted and could foreclose an option that I am certain we would come to regret for many years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. MEYERS) there were—ayes 15; noes 12.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently, a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2, rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 47]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—407

Ackerman	Broyhill	DioGuardi	Gaydos	Martinez	Scheuer
Addabbo	Bruce	Dixon	Gejdenson	Matsui	Schneider
Akaka	Bryant	Donnelly	Gekas	Mavroules	Schuetz
Alexander	Burton (CA)	Dorgan (ND)	Gephardt	Mazzoli	Schulze
Anderson	Burton (IN)	Dorman (CA)	Gilman	McCain	Schumer
Andrews	Bustamante	Dowdy	Gingrich	McCandless	Seiberling
Annuzio	Byron	Downey	Glickman	McCurdy	Sensenbrenner
Anthony	Callahan	Dreier	Gonzalez	McDade	Sharp
Applegate	Campbell	Duncan	Goodling	McEwen	Shaw
Armey	Carney	Durbin	Gordon	McGrath	Shelby
Aspin	Carper	Dwyer	Gradison	McHugh	Shumway
Atkins	Carr	Dymally	Gray (IL)	McKernan	Shuster
Badham	Chandler	Dyson	Gray (PA)	McKinney	Sikorski
Barnard	Chappell	Early	Green	McMillan	Siljander
Barnes	Chapple	Eckart (OH)	Gregg	Meyers	Sisisky
Bartlett	Cheney	Eckert (NY)	Grothberg	Mica	Skeen
Barton	Clinger	Edgar	Guarini	Michel	Skelton
Bateman	Coats	Edwards (CA)	Gunderson	Mikulski	Slattery
Bates	Cobey	Edwards (OK)	Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)	Slaughter
Bedell	Coble	Emerson	Hall, Sam	Miller (OH)	Smith (FL)
Beilenson	Coelho	English	Hamilton	Miller (WA)	Smith (IA)
Bennett	Coleman (MO)	Erdreich	Hammerschmidt	Mineta	Smith (NE)
Bentley	Coleman (TX)	Evans (IA)	Hansen	Mitchell	Smith (NH)
Bereuter	Collins	Evans (IL)	Hatcher	Moakley	Smith (NJ)
Berman	Combest	Fascell	Hawkins	Mollinari	Smith, Denny
Bevill	Conte	Fawell	Hayes	Molohan	Smith, Robert
Blaggi	Conyers	Fazio	Hefner	Monson	Snowe
Billrakis	Cooper	Feighan	Heftel	Montgomery	Snyder
Bliley	Coughlin	Fiedler	Hendon	Moody	Solarz
Boehlert	Coyne	Fields	Henry	Moore	Solomon
Boggs	Craig	Fish	Hertel	Moorhead	Spence
Boland	Crane	Flippo	Hiller	Morrison (CT)	Spratt
Boner (TN)	Crockett	Florio	Hillis	Morrison (WA)	Staggers
Bonior (MI)	Daniel	Foglietta	Holt	Mrazek	Stallings
Bonker	Dannemeyer	Foley	Hopkins	Murphy	Stangeland
Borski	Darden	Ford (MI)	Horton	Murtha	Stenholm
Bosco	Daschle	Ford (TN)	Howard	Myers	Stokes
Boucher	Daub	Fowler	Hoyer	Natcher	Strang
Boulter	Davis	Frank	Hubbard	Neal	Stratton
Boxer	de la Garza	Franklin	Huckaby	Nelson	Studds
Breaux	DeLay	Frenzel	Hughes	Nichols	Stump
Brooks	Derrick	Frost	Hunter	Nielson	Sundquist
Broomfield	DeWine	Fuqua	Hutto	Nowak	Sweeney
Brown (CA)	Dickinson	Gallo	Hyde	O'Brien	Swift
Brown (CO)	Dicks	Garcia	Ireland	Oakar	Swindall
			Jacobs	Oberstar	Synar
			Jeffords	Obe	Tallon
			Johnson	Olin	Tauke
			Jones (NC)	Owens	Tauzin
			Jones (OK)	Oxley	Taylor
			Jones (TN)	Packard	Thomas (CA)
			Kanjorski	Panetta	Thomas (GA)
			Kaptur	Parris	Torres
			Kasich	Pashayan	Torricelli
			Kastenmeier	Pease	Towns
			Kemp	Penny	Traficant
			Kennelly	Pepper	Traxler
			Kildee	Perkins	Udall
			Kiecza	Petri	Valentine
			Kostmayer	Pickle	Vander Jagt
			Kramer	Porter	Vento
			LaFalce	Price	Visclosky
			Lagomarsino	Pursell	Volkmer
			Lantos	Quillen	Vucanovich
			Leach (IA)	Rahall	Walgren
			Leath (TX)	Rangel	Walker
			Lehman (CA)	Ray	Watkins
			Lehman (FL)	Regula	Waxman
			Leland	Reid	Weaver
			Lent	Richardson	Weber
			Levin (MI)	Ridge	Weiss
			Levine (CA)	Rinaldo	Wheat
			Lewis (CA)	Ritter	Whitehurst
			Lewis (FL)	Roberts	Whitley
			Lightfoot	Robinson	Whittaker
			Lipinski	Rodino	Whitten
			Livingston	Roe	Williams
			Lloyd	Roemer	Wirth
			Loeffler	Rogers	Wise
			Lott	Rose	Wolf
			Lowery (CA)	Rostenkowski	Wolpe
			Lowry (WA)	Roth	Wortley
			Lujan	Roukema	Wright
			Lungren	Rowland (CT)	Wyden
			Mack	Rowland (GA)	Wylie
			MacKay	Roybal	Yatron
			Madigan	Russo	Young (AK)
			Markey	Sabo	Young (FL)
			Marlenee	Savage	Young (MO)
			Martin (IL)	Saxton	Zschau
			Martin (NY)	Schaefer	

□ 1810

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred and seven Members have answered to their



names. A quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 288, noes 127, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

## AYES—288

Akaka	Evans (IL)	Lott
Alexander	Fascell	Lowery (CA)
Anderson	Pazio	Lowry (WA)
Andrews	Feighan	Lunnen
Anthony	Fiedler	Mack
Applegate	Flelds	MacKay
Archer	Fish	Manton
Armey	Flippo	Martin (IL)
Atkins	Florio	Martin (NY)
Badham	Foglietta	Martinez
Barnard	Foley	Mavroules
Bartlett	Ford (MI)	Mazzoli
Barton	Fowler	McCain
Bates	Franklin	McCandless
Bennett	Frenzel	McCurdy
Bereuter	Frost	McDade
Bevill	Fuqua	McEwen
Biaggi	Gaydos	McGrath
Billirakis	Gedjenson	McKernan
Bliley	Gekas	McMillan
Boggs	Gephardt	Mica
Boner (TN)	Gibbons	Michel
Bonker	Gillman	Mineta
Borski	Gingrich	Moakley
Boucher	Glickman	Mollinari
Boulter	Goodling	Mollohan
Breaux	Gordon	Monson
Broomfield	Gradison	Montgomery
Brown (CO)	Gregg	Morrison (WA)
Broyhill	Grotberg	Mrazek
Bruce	Guarini	Murphy
Bryant	Hall (OH)	Myers
Bustamante	Hall, Ralph	Natcher
Callahan	Hall, Sam	Neal
Campbell	Hamilton	Nelson
Carper	Hammerschmidt	Nichols
Carr	Hansen	Nielson
Chappell	Hatcher	Nowak
Chapple	Hefner	Oakar
Cheney	Hefter	Oberstar
Clinger	Hendon	Obey
Coats	Hertel	Oxley
Cobey	Hiller	Packard
Coble	Hillis	Panetta
Coelho	Hopkins	Pashayan
Coleman (TX)	Horton	Penny
Combest	Hubbard	Pepper
Cooper	Huckaby	Perkins
Coughlin	Hughes	Petri
Coyne	Hunter	Pickle
Craig	Hutto	Porter
Crane	Ireland	Quillen
Daniel	Jeffords	Ray
Dannemeyer	Jenkins	Regula
Darden	Jones (NC)	Ridge
Daschle	Jones (OK)	Robinson
Daub	Jones (TN)	Roe
Davis	Kanjorski	Roemer
de la Garza	Kasich	Rogers
DeLay	Kemp	Rose
Derrick	Kindness	Rostenkowski
Dickinson	Kramer	Roth
Dicks	LaFalce	Roukema
DioGuardi	Lagomarsino	Rowland (CT)
Donnelly	Lantos	Rowland (GA)
Dorgan (ND)	Leath (TX)	Sabo
Dowdy	Lehman (CA)	Savage
Downey	Lehman (FL)	Schaefer
Dreier	Leland	Scheuer
Duncan	Lent	Schuette
Durbin	Levin (MI)	Schulze
Dwyer	Levine (CA)	Schumer
Eckart (OH)	Lewis (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Eckert (NY)	Lewis (CA)	Sharp
Edwards (OK)	Lipinski	Shaw
Emerson	Livingston	Shelby
English	Lloyd	Shumway
Erdreich	Loeffler	

Shuster  
Sijander  
Slatsky  
Slattery  
Slaughter  
Smith (FL)  
Smith (IA)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith, Denny  
Snyder  
Solarz  
Solomon  
Spratt  
Staggers  
Stallings  
Stangeland  
Stenholm

Stump  
Sundquist  
Sweeney  
Swift  
Swindall  
Synar  
Tallon  
Tausin  
Taylor  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (GA)  
Torricelli  
Traficant  
Traxler  
Udall  
Valentine  
Vander Jagt  
Volkmer

Vucanovich  
Walker  
Watkins  
Waxman  
Weaver  
Weber  
Whitley  
Whitten  
Wirth  
Wise  
Wortley  
Wright  
Wyden  
Wyllie  
Yatron  
Young (FL)  
Young (MO)  
Zschau

## NOES—127

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Pursell
Addabbo	Gray (IL)	Rahall
Annuazio	Gray (PA)	Rangel
Aspin	Green	Reid
Barnes	Gunderson	Richardson
Bateman	Hawkins	Rinaldo
Bedell	Hayes	Ritter
Beilenson	Henry	Roberts
Bentley	Holt	Rodino
Berman	Howard	Roybal
Boehlert	Hoyer	Russo
Boland	Hyde	Saxton
Bonior (MI)	Jacobs	Schneider
Bosco	Johnson	Selberling
Boxer	Kaptur	Sikorski
Brooks	Kastenmeier	Skeen
Brown (CA)	Kennelly	Skelton
Burton (CA)	Kildee	Smith (NH)
Burton (IN)	Kiecicka	Smith, Robert
Byron	Kostmayer	Snowe
Carney	Leach (IA)	Spence
Chandler	Lightfoot	St Germain
Clay	Lujan	Stark
Coleman (MO)	Madigan	Stokes
Collins	Markey	Strang
Conte	Marlenee	Stratton
Conyers	Matsui	Studds
Crockett	McHugh	Tauke
DeWine	McKinney	Torres
Dingell	Meyers	Towns
Dixon	Mikulski	Vento
Dornan (CA)	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Dymally	Miller (OH)	Walgren
Dyson	Miller (WA)	Weiss
Early	Mitchell	Wheat
Edgar	Moorhead	Whitehurst
Edwards (CA)	Morrison (CT)	Whittaker
Evans (IA)	O'Brien	Williams
Fawell	Olin	Wolf
Ford (TN)	Owens	Wolpe
Frank	Parris	Young (AK)
Gallo	Pease	
Garcia	Price	

## NOT VOTING—17

AuCoin	Latta	Ortiz
Courter	Luken	Rudd
Dellums	Lundine	Schroeder
Hartnett	McCollum	Wilson
Kolbe	Moody	Yates
Kolter	Murtha	

## □ 1820

Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mrs. BYRON, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. MARKEY changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MARKEY and Mr. HENDON changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORRISON OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut: Page 7, after line 20, insert the following new subsection:

(1) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, the total amount authorized to be appropriated by subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) shall not exceed \$7,510,700,000.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] provides the House with the first opportunity to speak out in favor of freezing our expenditures in fiscal year 1986. In particular, this amendment reduces the authorization level for NASA from the \$7.841 billion in the bill, as amended on the last vote, to \$7,510,700,000, the amount which was appropriated, including supplemental appropriations, in fiscal year 1985.

It is not my intent to single out the NASA budget. However, this is the first major authorization bill for fiscal year 1986 to come before this House and we should not lose this opportunity to stand up for deficit reduction.

Many Members of this House, myself included, and in particular, also, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], believe that the time to start to implement the freeze on spending is now.

Obviously, there is a budget resolution still to come. Ultimately, it may decide this question. But we do not know we are going to get to a budget resolution. We do not know when we are going to get to act on the whole question of the Federal budget. But this is an opportunity for us to act now, and we should not avoid that responsibility or postpone our day of reckoning. If we cannot apply the logic of a budget freeze across the board, we are not going to get at the problem of the Federal deficit.

What this amendment would require is that NASA in 1986 spend no more dollars than we appropriated to it in fiscal year 1985. This amendment does not make the priority judgments about where this cut should come.

## □ 1830

The decision about where the cuts should be applied is going to be made either by further action by this House

on a conference report or by the Administrator of NASA. They are not being made by this amendment.

This is a vote on overall spending levels; not on the priorities with respect to the budget. This is not an attack on the hard work by the committee and its members, its chairman and ranking members who have labored to set appropriate priorities. I respect their efforts, but I think we must start by freezing dollar levels all across our budget if we are going to get our budget deficit under control.

Increases, with respect to our expenditures, are going to have to be paid for. They have to be paid for either by higher taxes or cuts somewhere else. I do not believe that people in this House will support the kinds of cuts in student loans, cuts in housing programs, cuts in mass transit assistance, cuts in agricultural programs and the like that would have to be made in order to find the funds to supply the extra \$330 million, which would be authorized without this amendment.

The approach to spending that I am proposing is the kind of approach that I believe we are going to have to be using across the board in our budget. Our failure to do it now at the start will be a signal of our unwillingness to do it down the road. I think this is an opportune time for the House to speak its will. In addition, what we vote here will send a message to our Budget Committee about what this House is prepared to do, so that the Budget Committee, in coming forward with its recommendations, will be able to understand the House's willingness to make the tough choices that need to be made.

The committee has come in essentially with the President's level on this budget. I do not think this House is prepared to adopt the President's budget as proposed. We shouldn't start the process by adopting the first of the President's budget proposals and putting ourselves in the circumstance of not being able to respond to the desperate need to do something about the budget deficit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say very briefly, I know the hour is late, we have engagements, commitments for the evening, I support the Morrison-Pursell amendment. I think we are going to see a trend of amendments coming up in the future with regard to

authorizations and appropriations bills in which many of us feel very strongly this year that we would like to maintain a budget authority freeze across the entire budget: Defense, domestic, and other programs related to some off-budget items.

I congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut. He has been a leader in this freeze movement. Maybe it is not enough, totally, to achieve a \$50 billion deficit, but this is a start. So, 5 percent in this budget from the authorized level, 1985, to hold the figure at the 1985 level, is appropriate for this House to support today.

I would ask the Members on behalf of this country and for all of us, taxpayers alike, that we endorse this amendment and vote yes on the Morrison amendment.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to inquire of the gentleman; that I understand the philosophy behind the amendment is a freeze, to go back to the fiscal year 1985 budget numbers?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FUQUA. Now, what would the position of the gentleman be, and also the gentleman from Michigan, of those budgets that have been submitted to the Congress, the President's budget, that are below the fiscal year 1985 funding level. The 1986 budget is below the 1985 budget. Is it your intention to bring those budgets up to the 1985 level?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. No. I personally do not have a particular position overall on each of those matters. I think they have to be decided on their own merits. However, I do believe that they should not in general be brought up above the level of 1985 expenditures.

There may be others who have different positions on that question, and they will have to decide that at the time. But the principle is that if we are going to do anything about this budget deficit, we are going to have to be able to hold the line. Perhaps we can do better than hold the line; there may be some areas where we can save additional funds. I am not proposing that that be done with respect to the NASA budget; I think people think it is a priority, but not so much of a priority that we can be starting here to spend additional funds for fiscal year 1986.

Mr. FUQUA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TAUKE. I commend the gentleman for offering this amendment. I

think it sends a very powerful message to not only the general public, but also the appropriate committees in Congress.

It is essential that we set as policy that we are not going to go above last year's spending levels on these discretionary programs. Because I do not notice too many people running around here embracing the President's budget cuts. I have not embraced all of them either, and I do not know anybody else who has.

If we start using his budget increases as our standard when we bring bills to the floor, we are going to be in deep, deep trouble when we come to other measures later on. If we are going to deal with the deficit in a responsible way, we have to freeze across the board and make additional cuts where necessary and where it is feasible.

I do not think asking for a freeze in this program is asking for anything that we do not want to have applied to other programs that will be brought before us.

I commend the gentleman for a very powerful statement on one of the first issues out of the chute.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McKINNEY. I would like to congratulate my colleague from Connecticut, and simply state we do not know if there is going to be a budget; we know we have not accepted the President's budget. This is the first authorization. If we are going to live up to what I hear all of us saying, "fairness, and hold the line and cut the deficit," it is going to have to be done authorization by authorization.

When NASA comes up to us with an appropriation, it will be lumped with a great many other subjects. I congratulate the gentleman; I certainly intend to vote for his amendment. There should be no exception in any program that comes before this Congress, including the military, in going over the 1985 budget.

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Michigan on a very powerful and important amendment. When people from all walks of life come into my office and say we can live with a freeze, and they are the very people who are out there on the front lines trying to meet the needs of people with very real and desperate needs, that is an indication to me that we are united in this Nation in at least one thing and that is that we are facing a crisis here in Washington.



If we do not begin to address that crisis bill by bill, appropriation by appropriation, we will not succeed in retaining the vitality and the growth that we have achieved in the last year, turning around the trade deficit and assuring the future of this country.

I congratulate the gentlemen and support their amendment.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I thank the gentlewoman for her very strong words of support.

I think in the kind of expressions that we are hearing in support of this amendment, we have an opportunity to start on what is going to be a long and difficult road to deal honestly with the deficit problem. I think that this is a first opportunity, and it certainly will not be the last, but if we do not send the message today I do not think we will get the opportunities in the future to deal with this in an equitable, evenhanded, and appropriate way.

I urge that you support the amendment.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, last September, Mr. MACKEY and I came before this body and offered an across-the-board freeze substitute amendment to the budget resolution. We only received 108 votes in favor of it. It was an idea whose time had not come. Today, it seems to be an idea whose time is beginning to come, and when the budget resolution comes to the floor, I hope that we will recognize that its time has come.

If that is the will of this body, then NASA, as well as Defense, as well as all of the other agencies of Government should sacrifice together, tighten their belts in an across-the-board freeze. Why am I opposing this amendment today? I am because that policy has not been set, and the one agency that you start to send off the wrong signal in cutting it back \$375 million, is the one agency that is advancing our science and technology which is the future of this country, which is the future of our economic competitiveness in the world markets, which is the future of giving our people vision, which is the future of the country.

□ 1840

I wish that the process were such as it is supposed to be where the budget resolution comes first, we express that overall budget philosophy, and then we come along and flesh it out in our authorization and appropriations bills. That has not been able to be the case.

Because of the delay in the budget on the Senate side, the fact that we are coming with the first authorization bill here, it is not the right signal to say that we are not going to press the frontiers of knowledge, that we are not going to move industrialization

into space, that we are not going to move pharmaceutical manufacturing that will find those wonder drugs for those dread diseases here on Earth. That is the wrong signal for us to send out.

If at some future time we adopt a budget resolution that freezes across the board, which I will support, and if the Budget Committee does not come forth, I will offer as a substitute, then I think it is incumbent on all of these agencies of Government that we make them toe the line and tighten up. But this is the wrong signal to send here.

The specific increase is a \$230 million item, which is the second year of the design and definition of the permanently manned space station, a station that, if in Earth orbit by 1992, the 500th year of the landing of Columbus and the discovery of the New World, we will have manufacturing in space, we will develop a \$60 billion industry of commercialization by the turn of the century, and ladies and gentleman, that is where we want this country to go.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Florida on his earlier statement with respect to the budget freeze amendments. The time is now, the game is different, and the Americans are looking for that deficit reduction.

What we are saying is we want to be fair across the board. You cannot protect a program and PURSELL another program, and another Member of Congress XYZ program. If we do that, we will never achieve that deficit reduction. We will never abide by the principle of an across-the-board cut. So let us be consistent today. This is the first big authorization bill on the floor.

Let us see where the test is today, that we can really face up to the deficit, be consistent, and tell every voter in Florida, Michigan, and anywhere else in this Nation that we want to be consistent and fair so that we treat every special interest group and everyone who is on the Federal dollar, and one out of every three Americans is now taking some subsidy from the Federal Government, that we want to treat everyone alike, but we all want to achieve the \$50-billion deficit reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. NELSON of Florida was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I would just respond, before I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut, I wish the gentleman from Michigan had been

consistent and supported the budget freeze substitute last year.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman. I want to tell the gentleman I voted with him and supported him on his freeze last time and I am going to be with him this year as well. I think we are going to have to start now.

I think it is important to recognize that in fiscal year 1981, the funding level for the NASA was \$5 billion. This proposal will still have the NASA funding level \$2½ billion above what it was in 1981, while many other programs in the discretionary category have suffered cuts.

So we are not sending the wrong signal. We have been sending the right signal that NASA can grow and develop, but this is the year when the signal for everyone is that we are going to have to freeze.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. To the contrary, the purchasing power of the dollars allocated to NASA as compared back to the year 1981 is \$500 million less.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement, and the gentleman from Connecticut for his statement. I was one of those 108 who stood up last year and tried to do this. You are right. It is an idea whose time has come. Like you, I invite everybody to join the Wright bandwagon this year.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is shortsighted. If you are really concerned about the future of the United States, this is not where we ought to cut.

How do we reduce that deficit? We are all interested in reducing the deficit. We reduce it by increasing the economic activity in this country, and what does this budget do? This budget takes us into a new frontier, into better ways of doing things, research into new engines that will save energy, research in avionics. What industry is there that produces such a positive balance of trade for the United States other than the aviation industry?

The economic benefits of this program, of this research that we are doing, Mr. Chairman, for every dollar

invested, it returns from \$7 to \$14. What do we get from it? Why do I say that it is an investment? We get such things as heart monitors for patients who have been in intensive care and are beginning to move out of intensive care. We get new medicine, new medicines for diabetes, for arthritis, yes, even for cancer. Time release implants for medication. Miniaturization of computers. That is where we make money. That is where the taxes will come from to balance that budget. Lightweight materials. Ceramics so we do not have to depend on foreign material.

Let me just say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that such a cut will seriously damage our progress and I would hope that this House turns down that amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER TO THE  
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORRISON OF  
CONNECTICUT

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER to the amendment offered by Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut: On line 4 following "\$7,510,700,000." add the following: "Provided, however, That none of the reductions caused by this subsection shall be made in activities related to commercial space development."

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if we are to proceed with the freeze concept, and I think some of the people here who have made the arguments make them very articulately not just about this program but that they are going to make all of these cuts in the future, and I assure them that I will be out here making certain that if they do not do it, that they get done.

But the point here is that I think that we do not have to accept, though, the 1985 priorities. The President set forth some very specific priorities in his budget. He said that it is time to move toward commercial development of outer space, and he said that based upon some very important economic figures.

Chase Econometrics has taken a look at what space development means. The adoption of this amendment, or this amendment by Mr. MORRISON, if it is to come out of commercial space activities, will result in the loss of 320,000 jobs, according to Chase Econometrics. It will result in a \$9.2 billion loss in gross national product, according to the figures of Chase Econometrics.

I do not know about you, but I do not have a district and I do not think very many people have districts that can afford a job loss of 320,000 jobs or a loss of GNP of \$9.2 billion.

Where does that come from? Chase Econometrics says that for every billion dollars extra investment by the Federal Government in space, it re-

sults in the creation of 800,000 jobs, or it increases the gross national product by \$23 billion.

□ 1850

The \$375 million in this amendment works out to the kind of figures I just discussed.

What does my amendment do? My amendment says, "If you want to freeze, OK, fine, freeze. Get the \$375 million, but don't do it in a way that eliminates jobs and eliminates GNP. Keep the commercial space development. Keep the future intact. Make certain we continue to move into outer space aggressively and create jobs and create a real future."

So my amendment is an amendment that says, "Keep the space station in place. Keep going forward on that because that is the commercial future. Keep the commercial space office fully funded, because that is where the jobs are. Make certain that we continue the progress toward jobs."

It would be a shame to come on this floor with freeze-type amendments that in fact undercut the economy of this country. I am afraid that unless we adopt an amendment such as the one I offer here, that is exactly what we are going to be doing in the NASA budget.

So I would plead with the Members, if we are going to freeze, let us go ahead and freeze, but let us save 320,000 jobs. If we are going to freeze, let us save \$9.2 billion in GNP. Let us at least do that and adopt some of the President's priorities about economic growth in the future rather than simply adopting the priorities of 1985 in the freeze-type approach.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Walker amendment and in support of the Morrison amendment.

First of all Mr. Chairman, I want the Members to know that if they support the Walker amendment, they will be supporting only commercial space development really, because what he does is he takes all the cuts out of planetary sciences, astronomy, life sciences, and aeronautics and puts it all into commercial space development. That is really a ridiculous thing to be doing for the future of the country, as the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN] said. So I would urge the Members to vote against the Walker amendment.

Let me tell the Members something. This is really a tough issue for me because I am a subcommittee chairman of this committee, and I have got a lot of jurisdiction, including \$700 million in the aeronautics budget. But I have been around the country advocating a freeze, and it has got to start somewhere.

My colleague, the gentleman from Florida, talked about the signals, that this is a bad signal to send. I will be honest. I think it is a worse signal to send if we start exempting all of our programs out until we get a budget resolution. We may never get a budget resolution. I hope we do. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] is able to provide one.

But those cuts must start somewhere, and if it does not start in an area which affects me in my aeronautics budget, where is it going to start? It is going to start nowhere because no one will ever be willing to provide it.

The question is, can NASA give a few hundred million dollars in its budget without crippling itself? My best guess is, yes, they can give a few hundred million dollars in their budget without crippling themselves.

I do not like the amendment. I think that it is an across-the-board amendment. It has got some irresponsible character to it. But we have a crisis in America, and the crisis is that we are bleeding to death because of high deficits, and if we do not start here, we will never start anywhere.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members today to vote against the Walker amendment. It is highly irresponsible. It will work against the scientific advance of this country. And, reluctantly, I urge the Members to vote for the Morrison amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment as well as the original amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on the floor of the House is not the appropriate place for us to pick and choose what programs are going to remain funded and what programs are not. That is the job of the subcommittee and the job of the committee, and I feel our committees have done an excellent job in bringing this bill to the floor of the House.

I personally think that the worst thing we could do, if we want to implement a freeze program, which I have supported all along, would be to do it on a piecemeal basis by which we relegate to the Members of this Congress the right to pick and choose what programs they wish to freeze and what programs they wish to disregard as far as the deficits are concerned.

I think if we are going to freeze, we are going to have to have an across-the-board freeze, and this is not the way to do it, to take the first bill where the President has suggested an increase and freeze, with the expectation that in the future every other bill and every other program will be frozen, too. I am convinced the Congress will not act responsibly in following through with subsequent requests for a freeze, and for that reason I believe that it would be a mistake to



freeze this program when it is perceived by both the committee and the subcommittees and the administration to be a valuable enough program to call for increases at this particular time, expecting that there would be a freeze in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to the Members of the House that I have been talking lately to everyone who will listen: what \$200 billion deficits going out to infinity will do to our children. In the 5 years that I have been privileged to be a Member of this body, the Congress has added \$1 trillion of debt to the \$1 trillion that was already there, and it will reach \$2 trillion very soon. The numbers get so large that sometimes it becomes mind boggling.

But let me put it in perspective for the Members. What this \$2 trillion of debt will mean is that every one of our children will pay \$100,000 in extra taxes during their productive lives just to carry the interest cost. Last year's \$200 billion of deficit is going to cost each one of our children \$10,000 more to pay just to carry the interest on that deficit.

What does that mean? That means that our children and our grandchildren can no longer have the same economic opportunities to grow in a free society that you and I have had and that our parents have had—unless we do something to stop this drenching of red ink. Already, young people look forward to a Social Security system that is going to give them back 75 cents on the dollar. By contrast, the people who are retiring today receive \$3 or more on every dollar they invested.

Already, young people cannot buy a home because interest rates are so high. They are so high because we in the Congress cannot clean our fiscal house and cannot bring down this deficit and bring down interest rates to give them the same opportunities that we had.

Mr. Chairman, there is only one way that we are ever going to take hold of this problem. That is to freeze every program and every authorization at last year's level, and then work our way down to getting the budget into balance.

I think NASA can survive on \$7 billion. I think they can do it at least for 1 year.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to adopt the original Morrison amendment, and I commend the gentleman from Connecticut for offering it.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I am not going to take much time of the committee, and I can hardly add much to the "profile in courage" that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] gave us just a few minutes ago. But for the past 4 years I have heard the same arguments as chairman of the Budget Committee, that it is never the time to start the serious act of deficit reduction.

It is going to be very difficult for this Congress this year to pass a budget resolution. I think if all of us would reflect upon what our constituents are telling us, we would know they are telling us that "We are willing to share in the sacrifice to move toward a balanced budget, and we will accept a cut if everybody else is treated the same way."

That is a freeze resolution. It has to start somewhere. We can do much to advance the budget process by starting it here tonight and passing this freeze amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL]. I hope that we will put our votes where so many of us have put our rhetoric and vote for the Morrison amendment.

□ 1900

Mr. PORTER. I commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for that statement, also one of courage. There is no way to get at this except to say no to increases in spending.

I would urge adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am willing to support a freeze. I have only one qualification on that, and that is that it be a freeze that extends across the board.

I am not a profile in courage. It does not make too much difference to me in my district which way I vote on this, but I like to be consistent.

I favor actually a larger budget for NASA. I think it can be justified, but I would support a freeze if it is applied across the board.

Now, this is not going to be the courageous vote that some of you have said it is going to be. It is going to be a popular vote and a lot of you are going to get on it, because it is going to be popular.

Where it is going to be hard is when you get to the defense budget up here.

I ask you now, are you willing to really be courageous and recognize that when you vote for a freeze here, you have committed yourself to a freeze across the board?

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. PURSELL. I cannot speak for all the Members here, but I know many on this side of the aisle are prepared to vote yes on a defense budget freeze across the board.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I would be happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from California on his statement. I believe there are many of us here who have already indicated a commitment to that concept, but I think it is a two-edged sword. You would also have to commit on the other side of the aisle that when social programs and entitlement programs come before this body, that they, too, would be frozen.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and I really appreciate the comments of the gentleman from California.

I spoke earlier. I want to be associated with them, with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JONES]. If we do not start tonight, if there is not the perception of fairness, when we do get to something like the gentleman is saying, like defense or a real cruncher, Social Security, the ball game is over. If you cannot start tonight, you are not going to make it.

Mr. BROWN of California. Well, I wanted to raise this, Mr. Chairman, because I want all of us to know where the courage is really going to be required. On this side it is going to be on the social issues. You know that.

On that side, it is going to be the defense issue.

Now, properly speaking, these policies should be resolved in the normal course of events in our budget committee and brought to us in a way that we can take a vote as to what we want to do.

As the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma has indicated, that may not happen, and if it does not, we are going to have to take the action that is required here on the floor; but I am very reluctant personally to start it with this bill without the assurance that we are going to have the kind of discipline that is indicated and the kind of courage that is indicated in voting for a freeze across the board when these more difficult issues come up.

I do not think this vote is difficult. I think you can vote for a freeze here and think, well, it really does not commit me to do anything else, or I can vote not for a freeze here and say

that I will vote for it later on down the line when I see the picture.

I am convinced personally that we should support the administration's request on this bill, which is not unreasonable, and that we should if we later decide to have an across-the-board freeze cut it back in the Appropriations Committee, which is the proper place to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

# PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary situation here is that the first vote, as I understand it, is on the Walker amendment and not on the freeze itself, is that correct; regardless of the disposition of the Walker amendment, there will be a separate vote on the freeze, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MORRISON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

If not the Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

## TITLE II—SHUTTLE PRICING POLICY FOR COMMERCIAL AND FOREIGN USERS

### FINDINGS

SEC. 201. The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the Space Transportation System is a vital element of the United States space program, contributing to United States leadership in space research, technology, and development;

(2) the Space Transportation System is the primary space launch system for both United States national security and civil government missions;

(3) the Space Transportation System contributes to the expansion of United States private sector investment and involvement in space and therefore should serve commercial users;

(4) the availability of the Space Transportation System to foreign users for peaceful purposes is an important means of promoting international cooperative activities in the national interest and in maintaining the freedom of space for activities which enhance the security and welfare of mankind;

(5) the United States is committed to maintaining world leadership in space transportation;

(6) making the Space Transportation System fully operational and cost effective in providing routine access to space will maximize the national economic benefits of the system; and

(7) national goals and the objectives for the Space Transportation System can be furthered by a stable and fair pricing policy for the Space Transportation System.

### PURPOSE

SEC. 202. The purpose of this title is to set a reimbursement pricing policy for the Space Transportation System for commercial and foreign users which is consistent with the objectives of the Space Transportation System and encourages the full and effective use of space.

### DEFINITIONS

SEC. 203. For purposes of this title, the term—

(1) "Administrator" means the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(2) "additive costs" means the direct and indirect costs to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of providing additional flights of the Space Transportation System beyond the costs associated with those flights necessary to meet the United States Government's space transportation needs, including the average direct and indirect costs of program charges for manpower, expended hardware, refurbishment of hardware, spare parts, propellants, provisions, consumables, launch and recovery services, program support, and contract administration;

(3) "operating costs" means the total direct and indirect costs to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to operate the Space Transportation System, including the direct and indirect costs of program charges for manpower, expended hardware, refurbishment of hardware, spare parts, propellants, provisions, consumables, launch and recovery services, program support, and contract administration; and

(4) "capital recovery charge" means a charge determined by the Administrator based on the cost of an orbiter amortized over 100 flights.

### SHUTTLE PRICES FOR COMMERCIAL AND FOREIGN USERS

SEC. 204. (a) Except as provided in subsections (c) and (e), the Administrator shall charge each commercial or foreign user of the Space Transportation System, as reimbursement, a pro rata portion of an amount determined under subsection (b).

(b)(1) The amount referred to in subsection (a) shall be equal to the sum of—

(A) the average additive cost of a flight, plus

(B) a capital recovery charge for a flight.

(2) In no event shall the amount determined under paragraph (1) exceed the average operating cost of a dedicated commercial flight of the Space Transportation System.

(c) The Administrator may reduce the amount charged any commercial or foreign user of the Space Transportation System under this section (but not below that user's pro rata portion of the average additive cost of a flight of the Space Transportation System) as necessary to achieve one or more of the following goals:

(1) the preservation of the role of the United States as a leader in space research, technology, and development;

(2) the efficient use of the Space Transportation System;

(3) the long range goal of greatly increasing commercial space activities; and

(4) the goal of enhancing the international competitive position of the United States in providing space transportation services and capabilities.

(d) For purposes of this title, the Administrator shall assume twenty-four flights per year of the Space Transportation System.

(e) The Administrator may—

(1) set an amount lower than the amount determined under subsections (a), (b), and (c), or

(2) provide no-cost flights, for any commercial or foreign users of the Space Transportation System who is involved in research and development programs with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

### EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 205. This title shall apply to flights of the Space Transportation System during the period beginning on October 1, 1988, and ending on September 30, 1991.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title II?

### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: On page 13, strike title II and insert in lieu thereof the following:

## TITLE II—SHUTTLE PRICING FOR COMMERCIAL AND FOREIGN USERS FINDINGS

SEC. 201. The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the Space Transportation System is a vital element of the United States space program, contributing to United States leadership in space research, technology, and development;

(2) the Space Transportation System is the primary space launch system for both United States national security civil government missions;

(3) the Space Transportation System contributes to the expansion of United States private sector investment and involvement in space and therefore should serve commercial users;

(4) the availability of the Space Transportation System to foreign users for peaceful purposes is an important means of promoting international cooperative activities in the national interest and in maintaining the freedom of space for activities which enhance the security and welfare of mankind;

(5) the United States is committed to maintaining world leadership in space transportation;

(6) making the Space Transportation System fully operational and cost effective in providing routine access to space will maximize the national economic benefits of the system; and

(7) national goals and the objectives for the Space Transportation System can be furthered by a stable and fair pricing policy for the Space Transportation System.

### PURPOSE

SEC. 202. The purpose of this title is to set a reimbursement pricing policy for the Space Transportation System for commercial and foreign users which is consistent with the objectives of the Space Transportation System and encourages the full and effective use of space.



## DEFINITIONS

SEC. 203. For purposes of this title, the term—

(1) "Administrator" means the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(2) "additive cost" means the direct and indirect costs to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of providing additional flights of the Space Transportation System beyond the costs associated with those flights necessary to meet the United States Government's space transportation needs, including the average direct and indirect costs of program charges for manpower, expended hardware, refurbishment of hardware, spare parts, propellants, provisions, consumables, launch and recovery services, program support, and contract administration;

(3) "operating costs" means the total direct and indirect costs to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to operate the Space Transportation System, including the direct and indirect costs of program charges for manpower, expended hardware, refurbishment of hardware, spare parts, propellants, provisions, consumables, launch and recovery services, program support, and contract administration; and

(4) "capital recovery charge" means a charge determined by the Administrator based on the cost of an orbiter amortized over 100 flights.

## SHUTTLE PRICES FOR COMMERCIAL AND FOREIGN USERS

SEC. 204. (a) Except as provided in subsections (c) and (f), the Administrator shall charge each commercial or foreign user of the Space Transportation System, as reimbursement, a pro rate portion of an amount determined under subsection (b).

(b)(1) The amount referred to in subsection (a) shall be equal to the sum of—

(A) the average additive cost of a flight, plus

(B) a capital recovery charge for a flight.

(2) In no event shall the amount determined under paragraph (1) exceed the average operating cost of a flight of the Space Transportation System plus the capital recovery charge.

(c) The Administrator shall reduce the amount charged any commercial or foreign user of the Space Transportation System under this section (but not below that user's pro rate portion of the average additive cost of a flight of the Space Transportation System) as necessary to achieve the following goals:

(1) the preservation of the role of the United States as a leader in space research, technology, and development;

(2) the efficient use of the Space Transportation System;

(3) the achievement of greatly increased commercial space activities; and

(4) the enhancement of the international competitive position of the United States in providing not less than two-thirds of all free world space transportation services and capabilities.

(d) The Administrator shall set rates of reimbursement in full consideration of the potential economic viability of alternative domestic launch services.

(e) For purposes of this title, the Administrator shall assume 24 flights per year of the Space Transportation System.

(f) The Administrator may—

(1) set an amount lower than the amount determined under subsections (a), (b), and (c), or

(2) provide no-cost flights, for any commercial or foreign user of the Space Trans-

portation System who is involved in research and development programs with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

## ROYALTY RECOVERY

SEC. 205. The Administrator shall examine and report to the Congress on the feasibility of providing space shuttle launch services on a basis of royalty recovery over the economic life of commercial products produced or processed in space.

## ON-ORBIT SERVICES

SEC. 206. The Administrator shall conduct a study and report to the Congress on a proposed pricing policy for certain services such as on-orbit service, repair or recovery of spacecraft.

## EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 207. This title shall apply to flights of the Space Transportation System during the period beginning on October 1, 1988, and ending on September 30, 1991.

Mr. WALKER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, in terms of priorities in this bill, this is probably the most important question that we face, and that is the question of future pricing of the shuttle loads. We have adopted in the committee an amendment relating to shuttle pricing that essentially freezes into place the present price on the shuttle. The problem with that is that it does some things, from my perspective, that create real problems out there.

First of all, we have just begun to develop in this country a commercial expendable launch vehicle industry. They are partially being developed because government has encouraged them to believe that there is a market for expendable launch vehicles in the future. In other words, this is private enterprise at work within the space community at the present time. This is where we have the potential for developing jobs in the future.

This amendment was offered in committee. There was a bipartisan vote on it. It was defeated 23 to 18 in committee, so it is a fairly controversial issue; but it does relate to the question of whether or not you want to see space used for commercial purposes.

Under my amendment, what we adopt is a flexible pricing policy. It allows the NASA administrator to price all the way from about \$45 million up to \$106 million. What that does is assure that at least we give the commercial ELV, expendable launch vehicle industry, a chance to survive. This does not guarantee that any of them are going to make it in the market place, but it does give them some hope that at some point in the future they are going to be able to survive.

Why is that important? Because we are on the verge of expanding a major space economy. If we send the wrong signals to investors at the present time, what we will end up doing is canceling out a large portion of the economy that we can develop. We will cancel a large number of jobs that can be created in this industry.

We are talking not just of thousands of jobs, not just hundreds of jobs, we are talking literally millions of jobs. In fact, if by the year 2010 you can create a trillion dollar economy in space, and that is indeed possible based on very conservative economic judgments, you create the 1985 equivalent of 35 million jobs that do not exist today.

□ 1910

If we begin the process of sending the wrong signals to the investment market at the present time, what you will end up doing is canceling out that option and spreading it out further down the line. I do not think that is what we want to be all about.

I think we ought to develop the kind of flexible pricing policy that assures that the NASA Administrator can take prices and set them based upon the market. We ought not be subsidizing shuttle flights. We ought not have the taxpayer paying a portion of what it costs to fly aboard the shuttle.

We ought to have a market price for the shuttle that is in reality what the real market is.

What this does is permit the NASA Administrator to, in fact, establish such a market price. Now, if you have a product out there that can only fly aboard the shuttle, that has the potential of real development in the future, that allows the NASA Administrator to price that low and allows it to fly, as a matter of fact, even lower than the pricing so that we can get that research and development done. But if you have like a communications satellite that is already proven in the marketplace, then this would allow the NASA Administrator to price that high providing that he attains a certain percentage, two-thirds of the market, for American products.

In other words, he can price low in order to keep a certain share of the market for American products. That is also important because you are competing now with the French that have their ARIANE flying. We want to make certain we do not give up the whole marketplace to ARIANE. It would be foolish to come to this floor and end up adopting something which was marketability for French products.

This amendment protects both sides of that. It protects the option for the ELV's in this country, to get their market in place. It also protects us against French interference in the total world market.

I will tell you that I think that this pricing policy is probably the most crucial decision that you will make. It is difficult to understand. It is not very easy to explain out here.

But the fact is that the future of space is wrapped up in what we make in terms of policy determinations on pricing. If we price too high we will drive competition out of the marketplace. If we price too low and subsidize, we will set a standard that will allow no commercial activity.

I would hope that you will adopt this amendment that allows the flexibility necessary to proceed into the future.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I want to recall for you the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, in the opening of the bill being supportive of the very technical and detailed language in the bill on the shuttle pricing policy. He supports this policy. The committee continuously had votes in the subcommittee and the full committee that supports the committee bill, and I urge you to stick with the committee language.

I will just briefly give you an explanation of what it is. The mission model is 24 flights a year. You can break that down into thirds. Eight flights are going to be DOD payloads. The second eight flights are going to be NASA science experiments, interplanetary missions. We know those 16 flights are going to fly. Whether or not the additional eight flights fly to make a total of 24 depends on whether or not our price is competitive with the French ARIANE. So we are not going to fly that additional eight flights. We are not going to be able to use this fantastic flying machine for those total 24 if we do not have a price that can compete in the international marketplace.

Now, let me tell you how close it is. The last year the French took 50 percent of the international competition on satellite business, communications satellites, 50 percent of them signed up to go on the ARIANE.

This is a policy judgment of our committee. We feel very strongly that it is not in the best interests of the mission, so we have gone through dozens and dozens of hearings and we have heard from the communities all involved, and we have heard from all the commercial users of the shuttle that there is real potential for \$60 billion in commercial development in space. And they support our kind of pricing policy.

Mr. VOLKMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. I just wish to commend the gentleman from Florida for his work on this pricing policy and I wish to also bring about that the French are now constructing a second launch facility and that within the time period when this pricing policy will go into effect, they will have the capability of taking 17 launches a year, which will basically, with their new launchers, the ARIANE 4 and 5, when they have it ready, then with them being able to do more than one payload at a time, they would be able to take it all away from the shuttle. And if we go along with the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as my colleague said, we can pretty well kiss those commercial payloads goodbye and we will just have the shuttle sitting on the ground.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the gentleman who served as the immediate past chairman of this Space Subcommittee, and I thank him for his insight.

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman.

I do want to correct the RECORD with regard to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri, because I think the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON] will admit that, in my amendment, we protect two-thirds of the marketplace for the United States against ARIANE. In the committee bill, there is no such protection, there is no such flat market share involved. So, therefore, my amendment not only gives us the option of earning more money, but in light of the last freeze, vote, we might be interested in earning a little bit more money out of the shuttle. But it also assures that we do not have ARIANE usurping more than one-third of the marketplace.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. The gentleman is indeed correct about protecting two-thirds of the market. Indeed, I helped him write that language.

However, in our examination and our conclusions, we have come to the conclusion that the Nation's best interest is served by keeping the price at approximately what it is.

Mr. FUQUA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, my chairman of the full committee.

Mr. FUQUA. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and rise in opposition to the Walker amendment. I think the language that is in the bill is appropriate language.

I have several concerns about the language of my friend from Pennsylvania, even though well-intentioned. But I hope that it does not prevail and

that we can keep the language that is currently in the bill.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the chairman.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in support of the amendment.

I do want to rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] because I think it is in the best interests of the space program of the United States.

The bill, as it stands today, calls for a reduction generally of what we are charging to date. Now, that is not exactly true. That is almost totally true.

Today, the cost on the shuttle for a full payload is \$71 million. Now, it is true that under the committee bill, it can go to \$71.4 million, just slightly above that.

But the thrust of that amendment is to take the cost down to \$45 million. You know, there is only one thing wrong with that, and that is generally the only decision that can be made is to either charge what we are charging now or charge less, except for \$400,000 that the amendment calls for.

Now, what brought this whole thing on, the shuttle pricing, of course, was the competition with the ARIANE. But also the administration's desire to recover some of the costs.

Now let me tell you what happens and what the bill now says should happen. A satellite—say a communications satellite that is launched into orbit and stays there—the earning potential of that satellite, I have been told, is up to \$1 billion, \$1 billion that that satellite can make during the time that it is up in orbit.

If that is the case, that there is that good profit in there, and that is \$1 billion profit, I might say, if there is that good profit in there, let us get some of that profit to reduce this deficit.

The Walker amendment says, all right, you should reduce the price in some instances and, as a matter of fact, he takes the same amount that is in the bill now, \$45 million.

□ 1920

Either the bill now or the Walker amendment, both of them can reduce it to \$45 million. The difference is that, under Mr. WALKER's amendment, you can take it up to 105 if you want to charge someone more than you are presently charging; you can do that.

Now the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has two other things in there that are particularly attractive to me, and that is that we have in this country the only country that has the capability of bringing something back from space.

Anybody can shoot it, and put it up in orbit—not anybody; the French, the



Russians, ourselves—all of the competitors can put it in orbit, but we are the only ones that can bring it back, or that can fix it. We ought to take advantage of that.

I pointed out in committee, when you go to Sears and buy a refrigerator, they say, "All right, for 10 percent more" or whatever the figure may be, "we'll fix it for you if it breaks down." We ought to do the same kind of marketing.

We ought to say to the launchers, "We'll charge you so much and then for a little extra, we'll give you a package deal that nobody else can offer if you'll come with us." That is the way to attract business.

We also can offer lower costs for royalties, but under Mr. WALKER's amendment, it guarantees that you capture two-thirds of the market, and that is a lot better than we are doing now; we only have half of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 201, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

#### AYES—206

Archer	Davis	Hyde
Armey	DeLay	Ireland
Aspin	DeWine	Johnson
Badham	DioGuardi	Kasich
Bartlett	Dornan (CA)	Kemp
Barton	Dreier	Kindness
Bateman	Duncan	Kolbe
Bedell	Dyson	Kostmayer
Bellenson	Eckert (NY)	Kramer
Bentley	Edwards (OK)	LaFalce
Bereuter	Emerson	Lagomarsino
Billakis	Erdreich	Leach (IA)
Bliley	Evans (IA)	Lent
Boehlert	Fawell	Lewis (CA)
Boulter	Feighan	Lewis (FL)
Breaux	Fiedler	Lightfoot
Broomfield	Fields	Livingston
Brown (CA)	Frank	Loeffler
Brown (CO)	Franklin	Lott
Broyhill	Frenzel	Lowry (WA)
Burton (IN)	Gallo	Lujan
Callahan	Gaydos	Lungren
Campbell	Gejdenson	Mack
Carney	Gekas	Madigan
Carper	Gilman	Martin (IL)
Chandler	Gingrich	Martin (NY)
Chapple	Goodling	Mazzoli
Cheney	Gradison	McCain
Clinger	Gregg	McCandless
Coats	Grotberg	McCollum
Cobey	Gunderson	McKernan
Coble	Hall, Sam	McMillan
Coleman (MO)	Hammerschmidt	Meyers
Coleman (TX)	Hansen	Michel
Combest	Hendon	Miller (CA)
Conte	Henry	Miller (OH)
Coughlin	Hiler	Miller (WA)
Craig	Holt	Monson
Crane	Hopkins	Moody
Daniel	Hubbard	Moore
Dannemeyer	Hughes	Moorhead
Daub	Hunter	Morrison (WA)

Murphy	Rowland (CT)	Sundquist
Myers	Russo	Sweeney
Nielson	Saxton	Swindall
O'Brien	Schaefer	Tallon
Oberstar	Schneider	Tauke
Obey	Schuette	Tauzin
Olin	Schumer	Taylor
Oxley	Sensenbrenner	Thomas (CA)
Packard	Shaw	Vander Jagt
Parris	Shumway	Viscosky
Pashayan	Shuster	Vucanovich
Penny	Siljander	Walker
Petri	Skeen	Weaver
Porter	Slaughter	Weber
Pursell	Smith (NE)	Whitehurst
Quillen	Smith (NH)	Whittaker
Regula	Smith, Denny	Wise
Reid	Smith, Robert	Wolf
Ridge	Snowe	Wolpe
Rinaldo	Snyder	Wortley
Ritter	Solomon	Wyden
Roberts	Spence	Wyllie
Robinson	Stangeland	Yatron
Roemer	Stenholm	Young (AK)
Rogers	Strang	Young (FL)
Roth	Studds	Zschau
Roukema	Stump	

#### NOES—201

Ackerman	Ford (MI)	Morrison (CT)
Addabbo	Ford (TN)	Mrazek
Akaka	Fowler	Murtha
Anderson	Frost	Natcher
Andrews	Fuqua	Neal
Annuzio	Garcla	Nelson
Anthony	Gephardt	Nichols
Applegate	Gibbons	Nowak
Atkins	Glickman	Oakar
AuCoin	Gonzalez	Owens
Barnard	Gordon	Panetta
Barnes	Gray (IL)	Pease
Bates	Gray (PA)	Pepper
Bennett	Green	Perkins
Berman	Guarini	Pickle
Bevill	Hall (OH)	Price
Blaggi	Hall, Ralph	Rahall
Boggs	Hamilton	Rangel
Boland	Hatcher	Ray
Boner (TN)	Hawkins	Richardson
Bonior (MI)	Hayes	Rodino
Bonker	Hefner	Roe
Borski	Heftel	Rose
Bosco	Hertel	Rostenkowski
Boucher	Howard	Rowland (GA)
Boxer	Hoyer	Roybal
Brooks	Huckaby	Sabo
Bruce	Hutto	Scheuer
Bryant	Jeffords	Seiberling
Burton (CA)	Jenkins	Sharp
Bustamante	Jones (NC)	Shelby
Byron	Jones (OK)	Sikorski
Carr	Jones (TN)	Sisisky
Chappell	Kanjorski	Skelton
Clay	Kaptur	Slattery
Coelho	Kastenmeier	Smith (FL)
Collins	Kennelly	Smith (IA)
Conyers	Kildee	Smith (NJ)
Cooper	Klecicka	Solarz
Coyne	Lantos	Spratt
Darden	Leath (TX)	St Germain
Daschle	Lehman (CA)	Staggers
de la Garza	Lehman (FL)	Stallings
Derrick	Leland	Stark
Dickinson	Levin (MI)	Stokes
Dicks	Levine (CA)	Stratton
Dingell	Lloyd	Swift
Donnelly	Lowery (CA)	Synar
Dorgan (ND)	MacKay	Thomas (GA)
Dowdy	Manton	Torres
Downey	Markay	Torricelli
Durbin	Martinez	Towns
Dwyer	Matsui	Trafcant
Dymally	Mavroules	Traxler
Early	McCurdy	Udall
Eckart (OH)	McDade	Valentine
Edgar	McEwen	Vento
Edwards (CA)	McGrath	Volkmer
English	McHugh	Walgren
Evans (IL)	McKinney	Watkins
Fascell	Mica	Waxman
Fazio	Mikulski	Weiss
Fish	Mineta	Wheat
Flippo	Moakley	Whitley
Florio	Molinar	Whitten
Foglietta	Mollohan	Wirth
Foley	Montgomery	Young (MO)

#### NOT VOTING—25

Alexander	Kolter	Savage
Courter	Latta	Schroeder
Crockett	Lipinski	Schulze
Dellums	Luken	Williams
Dixon	Lundine	Wilson
Hartnett	Marlenee	Wright
Hillis	Mitchell	Yates
Horton	Ortiz	
Jacobs	Rudd	

□ 1930

Mr. DE LA GARZA changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. HAMMERSCHMIDT, DE LA GARZA, HOPKINS, ROBINSON, LENT, MILLER of California, OBERSTAR, SCHUMER, and STUDDS changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1940

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

#### TITLE III—OFFICE OF COMMERCIAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION

Sec. 301. Section 24 of the Commercial Space Launch Act (Public Law 98-575; 98 Stat. 3064) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this Act \$586,000 for fiscal year 1986."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title III?

Are there any further amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MOAKLEY] having assumed the chair, Mr. TORRES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1714) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control and data communications, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 119, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate recorded vote on the Morrison-Pursell freeze amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 7, after line 20, insert the following new subsection:

(1) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, the total amount authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a), (b), (c), and (d) shall not exceed \$7,510,700,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 369, noes 36, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

#### AYES—369

Ackerman	Collins	Gekas
Addabbo	Combust	Gephardt
Akaka	Conte	Gibbons
Andrews	Cooper	Gilman
Annunzio	Coughlin	Gingrich
Anthony	Craig	Glickman
Applegate	Crane	Goodling
Archer	Daniel	Gordon
Aspin	Dannemeyer	Gradison
Atkins	Darden	Gray (IL)
AuCoin	Daschle	Gray (PA)
Badham	Daub	Gregg
Barnard	Davis	Grothberg
Bartlett	de la Garza	Guarini
Barton	DeLay	Gunderson
Bateman	Derrick	Hall (OH)
Bates	Dickinson	Hall, Ralph
Bedell	Dicks	Hall, Sam
Beilenson	Dingell	Hamilton
Bennett	DioGuardi	Hammerschmidt
Bereuter	Dixon	Hansen
Berman	Dorgan (ND)	Hatcher
Bevill	Dornan (CA)	Hayes
Biaggi	Dowdy	Hefner
Bilirakis	Downey	Heftel
Bliley	Dreier	Hendon
Boehlert	Duncan	Henry
Boner (TN)	Durbin	Hertel
Bonior (MI)	Dwyer	Hiler
Bonker	Dymally	Hopkins
Borski	Dyson	Hoyer
Bosco	Eckart (OH)	Hubbard
Boucher	Eckert (NY)	Huckaby
Boulter	Edgar	Hughes
Boxer	Edwards (CA)	Hunter
Breaux	Edwards (OK)	Hutto
Brooks	Emerson	Ireland
Broomfield	English	Jeffords
Brown (CO)	Erdreich	Jenkins
Broyhill	Evans (IA)	Johnson
Bruce	Evans (IL)	Jones (NC)
Bryant	Fascell	Jones (OK)
Burton (CA)	Fawell	Jones (TN)
Burton (IN)	Fazio	Kanjorski
Bustamante	Feighan	Kaptur
Byron	Fields	Kasich
Callahan	Fish	Kastenmeier
Campbell	Flippo	Kennelly
Carney	Florio	Kindness
Carper	Foglietta	Kieccka
Carr	Foley	Kolbe
Chandler	Ford (MI)	Kostmayer
Chappell	Ford (TN)	Kramer
Chapple	Fowler	LaFalce
Cheney	Frank	Lagomarsino
Clinger	Franklin	Lantos
Coats	Frenzel	Leach (IA)
Cobey	Frost	Leath (TX)
Coble	Fuqua	Lehman (CA)
Coelho	Gallo	Lehman (FL)
Coleman (MO)	Gaydos	Leland
Coleman (TX)	Gejdenson	Lent

Levin (MI)	Panetta	Smith, Robert
Lewis (FL)	Parris	Snowe
Lightfoot	Pashayan	Snyder
Lloyd	Pease	Solarz
Loeffler	Penny	Solomon
Lott	Perkins	Spence
Lowry (WA)	Petri	Spratt
Lujan	Pickle	St Germain
Lungren	Porter	Staggers
Mack	Price	Stallings
Madigan	Pursell	Stangeland
Manton	Rahall	Stenholm
Marlenee	Rangel	Strang
Martin (IL)	Ray	Stratton
Martin (NY)	Regula	Studds
Martinez	Reid	Stump
Matsui	Richardson	Sundquist
Mavroules	Ridge	Sweeney
Mazzoli	Rinaldo	Swift
McCain	Ritter	Swindall
McCandless	Roberts	Synar
McCollum	Robinson	Tallon
McCurdy	Rodino	Tauke
McDade	Roe	Tauzin
McEwen	Roemer	Taylor
McGrath	Rogers	Thomas (CA)
McHugh	Rose	Thomas (GA)
McKernan	Rostenkowski	Torres
McKinney	Roth	Torricelli
McMillan	Roukema	Towns
Meyers	Rowland (CT)	Trafficant
Michel	Rowland (GA)	Traxler
Mikulski	Roybal	Udall
Miller (CA)	Russo	Valentine
Miller (OH)	Sabo	Vander Jagt
Miller (WA)	Saxton	Vento
Moakley	Schaefer	Visclosky
Mollinari	Scheuer	Volkmer
Mollohan	Schneider	Vucanovich
Monson	Schuette	Walgren
Montgomery	Schumer	Walker
Moody	Seiberling	Watkins
Moore	Sensenbrenner	Weaver
Morrison (CT)	Sharp	Weber
Morrison (WA)	Shaw	Weiss
Mrazek	Shelby	Wheat
Murphy	Shumway	Whitehurst
Murtha	Shuster	Whitley
Myers	Sikorski	Whittaker
Natcher	Siljander	Whitten
Neal	Sisisky	Wirth
Nichols	Skeen	Wise
Nielson	Skelton	Wolf
Nowak	Slattery	Wolpe
O'Brien	Slaughter	Wortley
Oberstar	Smith (FL)	Wyden
Obey	Smith (IA)	Wylie
Olin	Smith (NE)	Yatron
Owens	Smith (NH)	Young (AK)
Oxley	Smith (NJ)	Young (MO)
Packard	Smith, Denny	Zschau

#### NOES—36

Anderson	Garcia	Lowery (CA)
Armey	Gonzalez	Markey
Barnes	Green	Mica
Boland	Hawkins	Mineta
Brown (CA)	Holt	Moorhead
Clay	Howard	Nelson
Conyers	Hyde	Oakar
Coyne	Kemp	Pepper
DeWine	Kildee	Stokes
Donnelly	Levine (CA)	Waxman
Early	Lewis (CA)	Williams
Fiedler	Livingston	Young (FL)

#### NOT VOTING—27

Alexander	Jacobs	Quillen
Bentley	Kolter	Rudd
Boggs	Latta	Savage
Courter	Lipinski	Schroeder
Crockett	Luken	Schulze
Dellums	Lundine	Stark
Hartnett	MacKay	Wilson
Hillis	Mitchell	Wright
Horton	Ortiz	Yates

□ 2000

Mr. MOORHEAD changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 395, noes 3, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

#### AYES—395

Ackerman	Conte	Glickman
Addabbo	Cooper	Gonzalez
Akaka	Coughlin	Gordon
Anderson	Coyne	Gradison
Andrews	Craig	Gray (IL)
Annunzio	Crane	Gray (PA)
Anthony	Daniel	Green
Archer	Dannemeyer	Gregg
Armey	Darden	Grothberg
Aspin	Daschle	Guarini
Atkins	Daub	Gunderson
AuCoin	Davis	Hall, Ralph
Badham	de la Garza	Hall, Sam
Barnard	DeLay	Hamilton
Barnes	Derrick	Hammerschmidt
Bartlett	DeWine	Hansen
Barton	Dickinson	Hatcher
Bateman	Dicks	Hawkins
Bates	Dingell	Hayes
Bedell	DioGuardi	Hefner
Bellenson	Dixon	Heftel
Bennett	Donnelly	Hendon
Bereuter	Dorgan (ND)	Henry
Berman	Dornan (CA)	Hertel
Bevill	Dowdy	Hiler
Biaggi	Downey	Holt
Bilirakis	Dreier	Hopkins
Bliley	Duncan	Howard
Boehlert	Durbin	Hoyer
Boggs	Dwyer	Hubbard
Boland	Dymally	Huckaby
Boner (TN)	Dyson	Hughes
Bonior (MI)	Early	Hunter
Bonker	Eckart (OH)	Hutto
Borski	Eckert (NY)	Hyde
Bosco	Edwards (CA)	Ireland
Boucher	Edwards (OK)	Jeffords
Boulter	Emerson	Jenkins
Boxer	English	Johnson
Breaux	Erdreich	Jones (NC)
Brooks	Evans (IA)	Jones (OK)
Broomfield	Evans (IL)	Jones (TN)
Brown (CA)	Fascell	Kanjorski
Brown (CO)	Fawell	Kaptur
Broyhill	Fazio	Kasich
Bruce	Feighan	Kastenmeier
Bryant	Fiedler	Kemp
Burton (CA)	Fields	Kennelly
Burton (IN)	Flippo	Kildee
Bustamante	Florio	Kindness
Byron	Foglietta	Kieccka
Callahan	Foley	Kolbe
Carney	Ford (MI)	Kostmayer
Carper	Ford (TN)	Kramer
Carr	Fowler	LaFalce
Chandler	Frank	Lagomarsino
Chappell	Franklin	Lantos
Chapple	Frenzel	Leach (IA)
Cheney	Franklin	Leath (TX)
Clinger	Frenzel	Lehman (CA)
Coats	Frost	Lehman (FL)
Cobey	Fuqua	Leland
Coble	Gallo	Lent
Coelho	Gaydos	
Coleman (MO)	Gejdenson	
Coleman (TX)		
Collins		
Combust		



Lloyd	Packard	Solarz
Loeffler	Panetta	Solomon
Lott	Parris	Spence
Lowery (CA)	Pashayan	Spratt
Lowry (WA)	Pease	St Germain
Lujan	Penny	Staggers
Lungren	Perkins	Stallings
Mack	Petri	Stangeland
Madigan	Pickle	Stark
Manton	Porter	Stenholm
Markey	Price	Stokes
Marlenee	Pursell	Strang
Martin (IL)	Rangel	Stratton
Martin (NY)	Ray	Studds
Martinez	Regula	Stump
Matsui	Reid	Sundquist
Mavroules	Richardson	Sweeney
Mazzoli	Ridge	Swift
McCain	Rinaldo	Swindall
McCandless	Ritter	Synar
McCollum	Roberts	Tallion
McDade	Robinson	Tauke
McEwen	Rodino	Tauzin
McGrath	Roe	Taylor
McHugh	Roemer	Thomas (CA)
McKernan	Rogers	Thomas (GA)
McKinney	Rose	Torres
McMillan	Rostenkowski	Torricelli
Meyers	Roukema	Towns
Mica	Rowland (CT)	Trafficant
Michel	Rowland (GA)	Traxler
Mikulski	Roybal	Udall
Miller (CA)	Russo	Valentine
Miller (OH)	Sabo	Vander Jagt
Miller (WA)	Saxton	Vento
Mineta	Schaefer	Visclosky
Moakley	Scheuer	Volkmmer
Molinar	Schneider	Vucanovich
Mollohan	Schuetz	Walgren
Monson	Schumer	Walker
Montgomery	Seiberling	Watkins
Moody	Sensenbrenner	Waxman
Moore	Sharp	Weber
Moorhead	Shaw	Weiss
Morrison (CT)	Shelby	Wheat
Morrison (WA)	Shumway	Whitehurst
Mrazek	Shuster	Whitley
Murphy	Sikorski	Whittaker
Murtha	Siljander	Whitten
Myers	Sisisky	Williams
Natcher	Skeen	Wirth
Neal	Skeltion	Wise
Nelson	Slattery	Wolf
Nichols	Slaughter	Wolpe
Nielson	Smith (FL)	Wortley
Nowak	Smith (IA)	Wyden
O'Brien	Smith (NE)	Wyllie
Oskar	Smith (NH)	Yatron
Oberstar	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Obey	Smith, Denny	Young (FL)
Olin	Smith, Robert	Young (MO)
Owens	Snowe	Zschau
Oxley	Snyder	

## NOES—3

Conyers	Rahall	Weaver
---------	--------	--------

## NOT VOTING—34

Alexander	Hillis	Pepper
Applegate	Horton	Quillen
Bentley	Jacobs	Roth
Campbell	Kolter	Rudd
Courter	Latta	Savage
Crockett	Lipinski	Schroeder
Dellums	Luken	Schulze
Edgar	Lundine	Wilson
Fish	MacKay	Wright
Goodling	McCurdy	Yates
Hall (OH)	Mitchell	
Hartnett	Ortiz	

## □ 2010

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. WOLPE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening I was inadvertently away from this Chamber during three suspension votes. The first of these votes was H.R. 1373, which would designate the Point Reyes National Seashore as the Phillip Burton Wilderness Area. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" on H.R. 1373. The second of these votes was H.R. 1869, the contemporaneous recordkeeping bill, which would repeal current recordkeeping requirements regarding tax deductions for the business use of automobiles and similar property. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" on H.R. 1869. The third of these votes was House Concurrent Resolution 107, which calls on the President to take action to reduce our trade deficit with Japan. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" on House Concurrent Resolution 107.

## □ 2020

## CLASSIFIED REPORT ON U.S. SUPPORT FOR DEMOCRATIC RESISTANCE MOVEMENT IN NICARAGUA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. TRAFICANT] laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, April 3, 1985.)

## U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE SPECIAL FACILITY FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

(Mr. LUNDINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, we are all too well aware of the daily struggle for life currently taking place throughout sub-Saharan Africa. The bill passed yesterday is testimony to the fact that we in the United States care deeply about the welfare of those who lack the necessary food, shelter and clothing to survive. However, I think what is sometimes lost sight of in the immediacy of the current crisis

is what we are doing or can do to prevent such catastrophes from occurring again and again.

We must address the long-term as well as the short-term problems of Africa. The problems created by drought and the overall economic crisis in Africa have not come about only in the last 3 years. They are the result of a long-term deterioration. Annual per-capita grain production in the 24 countries most seriously affected by the drought has been falling on the average of 2 percent a year ever since 1970. If this trend continues, per capita grain production will be lower in these countries in 1988 even with adequate rainfall, than it was in the drought year of 1984. Obviously, something must be done to reverse this trend.

A long-term development strategy must include a greater emphasis on human resource development, greater self-reliance, greater economic integration, and scientific and technical progress. Changes must be made in education and training to ensure greater relevance to the needs of African economies. Agricultural projects must be oriented toward the small landholders who make up the majority of the African population rather than targeted at large farms as has been the practice of the past. Resources must be used efficiently and the infrastructure necessary to development must be built.

These changes cannot be made successfully if we are not willing to provide the financial and technical support necessary to bring them about. Consequently, Congressman McHUGH and myself are today introducing legislation which would authorize U.S. participation in the special facility for sub-Saharan Africa. This special facility will be administered by the World Bank with its purpose being to transmit policy advice backed by development lending. Our bill proposes a U.S. contribution of \$450 million over a 3 year period and along with the contributions of other donor countries will create a pool of resources well in excess of \$1 billion for development lending solely to the countries of sub-Saharan Africa.

The need for this legislation is clear. In real terms, development lending to Africa has declined from the level achieved in the early 1980's. This situation comes at a time when short- and long-term prospects for African development are bleak. At the same time, many African governments have come to realize that internal economic policy adjustments are needed to help encourage greater food production and foster more successful development. Countries that have undertaken such measures have seen encouraging responses. While more countries are determined to alter their policies; domes-

tic, political, and economic constraints make it very difficult to implement further adjustments.

The special facility for sub-Saharan Africa will have as its primary goal the implementation of policy reforms to help the African countries to help themselves. To succeed, these efforts must be reinforced by development resources which help to ease the adjustment process. The appalling conditions prevalent in the countries of sub-Saharan Africa underscore the need for the United States to participate with the other aid donor countries in a coordinated framework. The special facility for sub-Saharan Africa provides such a framework while providing some of the additional development capital required to give Africans hope for the future.

#### TOWARD A COHERENT U.S. RESPONSE TO AFRICA'S LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

(Mr. McHUGH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives passed much needed funding legislation to meet the food crisis currently afflicting sub-Saharan Africa. All of us can be proud of the leadership role that our Nation has played in addressing the needs of the victims of famine in Africa, people whose tragedy has touched the lives of our people and people in other nations.

As I indicated yesterday, however, passage of this much needed legislation is not an answer to all of the problems that Africa faces. As important as our response to the immediate crisis is, the economic and political problems in Africa clearly require a more coherent, long-term strategy.

Today, along with my colleague from New York [Mr. LUNDINE], I am introducing legislation that responds to a growing consensus that Africa's problems must be solved by Africans themselves through the adoption of policy reforms designed to promote long-term, equitable, economic growth and development. Our bill would provide for a U.S. contribution of \$450 million to the special facility for sub-Saharan Africa, a new and temporary multilateral agency that is designed to provide the economic resources needed to support a difficult economic adjustment process.

The special facility was created out of a recognition that, pressing as the current crisis is, it is not short-term. Indeed, one need only examine the facts to recognize that sub-Saharan Africa lags far behind other regions of the world in some of the most basic indicators of development. For example, the 380 million people who live in Africa south of the Sahara have an av-

erage life expectancy of 49 years, the lowest in the world. There is only one doctor for every 21,000 people; not surprisingly, both infant mortality and population growth rates are also the highest in the world. Per capita income in sub-Saharan Africa is only \$491 per year.

These conditions predated the current draught, the worst in Africa's history, a draught which has seriously exacerbated those preexisting conditions and threatens millions of Africans with starvation and death. We must respond to the immediate crisis, but we must also come to grips with the deeper human and resource development problems which have long plagued Africa.

Burdened with a growing debt-service obligation, declining prices for primary export commodities, a low rate of return on capital investment, and food production that is lagging behind population growth, the prospects for Africa will remain bleak unless African governments undertake fundamental policy reforms.

To encourage and sustain the kind of changes that are needed, Africa desperately requires additional resources to stabilize and reform its teetering economies, as much as \$6 billion for the next 3 years according to one recent report.

Unless we and others face up to this larger issue, we will be regularly confronted with dire emergencies in Africa. The longer term development needs must be addressed. In the past, one of Africa's major sources of concessional financing for development purposes has been the International Development Association [IDA], the soft-loan window of the World Bank. However, even if commitments elsewhere are substantially reduced, IDA cannot increase its activities in Africa during the next 3 years because of a \$3 billion reduction in its overall lending program, a reduction forced on IDA by the United States over the objections of every other donor.

To help address the financing gap, the World Bank has created the special facility to push for policy reforms in Africa and has appealed to the world community for \$1 billion to support these reform efforts. Regrettably, the United States, which has traditionally been the leading proponent and sustainer of IDA, has not responded to this appeal. As a consequence, some other potential donors have also withheld their support.

The Reagan administration argues that the United States does not need to contribute to the special facility, both because it is increasing its bilateral economic aid programs for Africa and because the administration has its own program to encourage policy reforms there.

In fact, the administration is requesting less bilateral economic aid for

Africa next year than was originally requested for the current year. Moreover, if there should be future increases in bilateral aid, they will be at the expense of our reduced commitment to IDA.

As for the administration's program to support policy reform in Africa, the amount of funds involved is far too small to have a significant effect standing alone. If those funds were provided to the World Bank, they would leverage additional funds from other donors. This would result in a larger pool of funds which, when applied in a coordinated fashion, would more effectively promote the necessary economic reforms which are so essential to meaningful development. Furthermore, African governments are more likely to adopt reforms recommended by an international institution that is not perceived as having ulterior political motives.

What is needed, then, is a coherent U.S. response to the long-term problems that Africa faces. As a next step, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNDINE] and I believe the United States should respond affirmatively to the World Bank's appeal. That is what our bill does and we hope that our colleagues will join us in taking this next step.

#### STIFFER PENALTIES FOR MINORITY FRONT COMPANY ACTIVITIES

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion about the so-called front companies forming in an attempt to bilk the Federal moneys that are designed for minority businesses.

I do not think the front company problem is that big, but I do think we need to address it. I think it is being used to smear and discredit some programs.

Therefore, today I am introducing legislation amending the Small Business Act which would increase the penalties from 2 years imprisonment to 5 years imprisonment for each front company, and from \$5,000 to \$50,000 for everybody who tries to put up a front company.

I hate them. I hate front companies if they attempt to bilk from legitimate minority businesses.

There was a little song out that was popular a couple years ago: "Ebony and Ivory Living Together in Perfect Harmony."

I want them in jail. I want to put them in jail and let them sing that to each other in jail. Ebony and Ivory living together in perfect harmony.



Mr. Speaker, there is a serious effort underway to end all Federal funding and support for minority business development. Not only do these efforts include court action, and reductions in Federal funds, but smear and discredit tactics are being focused on front company activities as well. A front company is one which claims to be a minority firm, but the ownership, day-to-day management and operations are controlled by a nonminority person.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I have been made aware of such ineligible front company firms who routinely participate in Government-sponsored programs designed specifically to benefit minority businesses. While I applaud the effort of those who seek to prevent such dishonesty and lack of business integrity, it is apparent that there will always be a few avaricious business persons who will violate or circumvent the law to benefit from the various programs aimed at sustaining minority businesses in this country.

Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation which seeks to deter offenses of this kind by increasing fines for violation of section 16(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 645) from \$5,000 to \$50,000 and increasing prison sentences from 2 years to 5 years.

Although the extent to which front company activities pervade Federal programs has been blown out of proportion by critics of affirmative action, I do believe that legislation is warranted to discourage those few who, as a result of their rapacious nature, bring scandal and defamation to otherwise legitimate remedies to past and ongoing discrimination in Federal contracting and subcontracting programs.

Because the perpetrators of these schemes to steal economic opportunities from legitimate minority firms are threatening the very existence of minority and women-owned businesses in this country, both the minority and majority parties involved deserve punishments to suit their felonious crimes. I would like to encourage my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring and working for the enactment of this legislation.

#### ADDRESS BY BELISARIO BETANCUR, PRESIDENT OF COLOMBIA, TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. LELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, last year I had an opportunity to meet with President Belisario Betancur, President of Colombia. This morning he was here addressing some Members of Congress and other interested parties

and he made an incredible speech. I would like to enter this into the RECORD if I can for the purpose of our immediate membership and those who would read the RECORD to learn from this great man.

He is an outstanding leader in the Contadora movement. He is trying to bring peace to the Central American question, and I would hope that, indeed, he is successful.

ADDRESS BY BELISARIO BETANCUR, PRESIDENT OF COLOMBIA, TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, DC, APRIL 3, 1985

#### THE SUBVERSION OF UNDER DEVELOPMENT IN LATIN AMERICA

I am Belisario Betancur, freely elected, on my fourth attempt, President of a South American country called Colombia, with a territory equal to that of France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan combined, and with a population of almost 30 million people, distributed on the Caribbean Coast, the Pacific Coast, the Andean region, and along the Orinoco and Amazon regions. Without exaggeration, I could be taken as an example of a typical Latin American, for I am the second child of a semi-illiterate campesino family of 22 children, born of the same father and mother, 17 of whom died of a grave illness: subdevelopment. Struggling against such conditions, I was the only one in my hamlet who was able to study, sleeping in parks, and doing all kinds of work, from picking coffee beans as a child and working in bars, to writing for newspapers and being a university professor.

#### 1. Our mutual sin

North Americans as well as Latin Americans have to confess and be ashamed of the ugly sin of mutual ignorance, which, most of the time, denotes a lack of interest. The guilt is not unilateral, since if you at times are mistaken in identifying us, I must confess that few people in my country would be able to name the fifty states of the Union or point to them on a map; correspondingly, not even our nearest neighbors know that an hour away from Miami, in our beautiful Caribbean archipelago of San Andres and Providencia, surrounded by Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, Jamaica and the Cayman Islands, English is spoken and the predominant religion is Protestant.

#### 2. Returning to forgotten lessons

In Latin America the desire to satisfy our needs, has arrived tumultuously, upsetting the traditional structure, which gives this desire the inappropriate name of subversion: inappropriate because among ourselves very often the subversive agents are not the masses, nor the leaders, but the situations and needs.

As a result, we must repeat lessons that have been forgotten, or were never really learned, one way or another. It is our aspiration that we be given the benefit of a doubt, in regard to our desire for democracy. We prefer liberty; yes, we prefer democracy. We are not fighting with anyone in North America. It is just that people oppressed by misery, grasp at any straw, seek any port in a storm, above all when they cannot find development in liberty. But I have faith that in Latin America, Central America, and the Caribbean we prefer liberty. We prefer peace to war, because our only war is against underdevelopment. We are privileged survivors among the agony of people who, nevertheless, cherish the values of the American Constitution.

#### 3. The Contadora group

But, in spite of our problems, we like to look around and try to help, in a democratic and Christian way, neighbors who need us. Hence the philosophy and action of Contadora is founded in the need to give contemporary and worthy metaphysical answers to the subjective and objective agents that work in every subversive process. For this reason, the Act of Contadora has as its aims:

To ensure the defense and promotion of democracy in the Central American Isthmus through means of free and pluralistic elections of governments and representative institutions, eliminating all interferences in internal matters and all forces destabilizing the governments of the region;

To create opportunities for participation to those not in agreement, so that in a state of reconciliation they become part of the solution to their country's national and international problems;

To give dignified answers to subjective or personal subversive factors, so that there are only free people in our homelands making exile and clandestine operations unnecessary; for it is our conviction that in a democracy all ideologies may exist without fear;

To make subversion impossible because the objective factors that motivate it will be eliminated by creating financial support for a social infrastructure such as hospitals, schools, water supplies, food production, sewerage systems, employment, cheap credit, and fair prices for products;

To seek peaceful solutions to conflicts, giving more importance to dialogue and the rejection of all military intervention, since we are convinced that such intervention would unchain a subversive wave throughout Latin America and the Caribbean;

To achieve, as its consequence, the demilitarization of Central America and the departure of foreign military experts.

In this we coincide with what Indiana Representative Lee H. Hamilton has said: "Military action alone will not resolve the underlying problems of the region and will not neutralize the advances of communism in the long run."<sup>1</sup> And with the Congressman from Arkansas, William Alexander, who says that "What is important is not who has the most powerful weapons, but who has the most valid political ideals, and who has the politics that offer the best response to the elemental prayers of Central Americans, more often motivated by Christianity than by Communism."<sup>2</sup>

All of which has as its basis that we recognize realistically, that peace in Central America requires that the countries interested in the region adhere to these principles. Because true peace is one and indissoluble, and war in any region affects it in the whole world. For that reason, Colombia likewise seeks agreement with internal armed groups, and also has encouraged agreement among opposing factions in other countries: we are proud that we are seen as a moral force rather than a military power. Thus we better serve democracy and humanity. Because definitely, we are citizens of the world, citizens of the cosmos as Carl Sagan would say.

I must not ignore the Report of the Bipartite Commission on Central America: we are attentive to its recommendations, even

<sup>1</sup> Lee H. Hamilton, "Covert Action Is Not in Our National Interest," *The Washington Post*, May, 1984

<sup>2</sup> William Alexander, "Schizoid Latin Policy," *The New York Times*, July, 2193.

though we are not in complete agreement with the Manichean philosophy of supporting only the social infrastructure of those who behave themselves. This treatment of the crisis reminds us of the obsolete Renaissance debate over which came first, the chicken or the egg. We hope that the recommendations of the Commission will lead to peace.

#### 4. Drugs as a destructive force

Permit me to touch on a painful theme. Drugs are a two-way tragedy: they weaken our two countries and destroy values that are the foundation of our moral and physical patrimony.

We are all daily victims of this plague.

Our two governments give no quarter in the struggle against drugs. Colombia has done it, and will continue to do it relentlessly, even if with material and logistic limitations. We have reached a point of no return, because we wish to be on the side of human dignity. We wish to look more at history than at our human condition. And we are disposed to pay the price, even of our own lives, which would be a small sacrifice to free humanity from this scourge.

But we do not wish to feel alone in this struggle, in which you, too, take part: For here is the greatest center of drug consumption. The tremendous wealth proceeding from drugs, is deposited here. North American banks launder fantastic sums of money and are barely punished. Many of the great North American drug traffickers live here. According to the Washington Post, "The Colombians are making a mighty effort, one extending far beyond the American preoccupation with law-enforcement (necessary as that is) and one costing them far more in basic social stability than the American drug problem (terrible as it is) costs the United States." And it is true: we continue to fumigate crops, destroy laboratories, seize shipments, jail criminals, and extradite nationals, for whom, notwithstanding, we request dignified treatment, at the same time that we insist on the extradition of North Americans who commit the same transnational crimes.

#### 5. Six proposals

In sum, I have the honor of submitting to you, Honorable Congressmen, the following proposals:

I. To establish an Alliance for Peace, Development and Democracy between the United States and Latin America;

II. In the case of Central America, support the Act of Contadora and the commitments inherent in it for all the countries that have an interest in the area; support plans to generate employment and construction for the physical and social infrastructure that the region requires, using the Interamerican Development Bank as the technical secretaryship and coordinating entity of the Advisory Group for the region, according to the general plan of the Kissinger Report;

III. Perfect the International Coffee Agreement, as a program of cooperation;

IV. Seek a better adjustment between fiscal politics and monetary politics of the United States and other industrialized countries, which is reflected in lower interest rates for the developing countries; and to facilitate the exports of these countries, eliminating protectionist barriers;

V. Strengthen multilateral credit organizations: without long-term credit directed to well-structured projects, it will not be possible to stimulate the growth of developing countries.

VI. Intensify the battle against drugs declared by the United Nations, a crime

against mankind: eradicate drug-producing crops in Latin America and in the United States, destroy drug processing laboratories, dismantle the international organization that controls drugs, strengthen the educational campaigns against their use, institute more severe punishments for drug users, and provide stimuli for the substitution of other crops;

#### 7. A driving force

The opportunity to converse with the representatives of this great democracy, could not pass without a new appeal to the spirit that has endured throughout the history of this nation: the same spirit that once permitted Jefferson to say that "every man, and every group of men on earth, possesses the right to self-government."

These groups of men and all humanity, will be more secure if we give them peace; if we give them dignity, if we give them courage. We wish to give them that courage, that dignity and that peace. We would feel very well accompanied if you—free citizens of this free and great nation—persist in that courage which has illuminated its great men since the time of Washington and that has been the glory of your people.

I wished to come to you to speak frankly, as a friend: no euphemism can you expect, for that reason, from the President of Colombia. Our Liberator, Simon Bolivar, used to say that the good friend of he who governs is he who speaks the truth.

Permit me, in the manner of Niels Bohr, one of the fathers of contemporary physics, to close this unforgettable encounter with his words: "Every phrase that I utter should be considered not as an affirmation, but as a question."

That is what we are: leaders who seek the ways of liberty to bring our people happiness through progress and justice. It says in the Bible: "And the Lord appeared to Solomon in a dream by night saying: Ask what thou wilt that I should give thee. And Solomon said: Give to thy servant an understanding heart, to judge thy people and discern between good and evil. And it was pleasing to the Lord that Solomon had asked such a thing. And the Lord said to Solomon: Because thou hast asked this thing, and hast not asked for thyself long life or riches, nor the lives of thy enemies, but hast asked for thyself wisdom to discern judgment, behold I have done for thee according to thy words, and have given thee a wise and understanding heart, inasmuch that there hath been no one like thee before thee, nor shall arise after thee." (I Kings 3:5-13).

With a wise and just heart, we should feel the moral duty to offer responses through democracy and liberty, to the anguished questions of America and the world.

#### ROBERT M. BOR, CHIEF COUNSEL OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute today to one of the finest public servants who has ever helped this House do the job the people sent us here to accomplish.

\* Cited by Jacob Bronowsky, *El Ascenso del Hombre*, Fondo Educativo Interamericano, Bogota 1979.

Just a few weeks ago, at the end of February, the Agriculture Committee's chief counsel, Robert M. Bor, retired from the committee to enter the private practice of law. I do not know of any member of any congressional staff who has a finer record.

Bob Bor's contributions to the Agriculture Committee would take more time to list than the 1-minute rule of the House would allow. But I know that every member who served on the committee in the years since he came to us from the Department of Agriculture in 1975 will agree that Bob's knowledge of legislation and agricultural programs made a tremendous contribution to the work of the committee.

We needed a counsel who could put our decisions into effective legal form. Bob did that for us, and more. He worked with our members and the staff to make sure that what we wanted to do was done well. His reports gave us the ammunition we needed for effective management of legislation in the House. His experience both in agricultural programs and in the working of the House gave us the backup that made our committee both stronger and better respected. And one thing more—Bob Bor has been one of the hardest working men most of us have ever known. When there was a job to do, he was there until it was done and done well.

I know that Members of Congress are not the only people who are grateful for the work Bob Bor did on the Hill. Many members of the broad agricultural community who have worked with him through the years on legislative and other problems have reason to admire his skill and to be grateful for his dedication.

Beyond all this, those of us who worked with Bob through these past years have come to know him as a man you can trust and depend on. I do not know whether there is any higher tribute you can pay a friend than to say that about—and I know we all say it about Bob.

Bob is a native of New York, a graduate of New York University and Columbia University Law School, an Army veteran of World War II, and a man who is lucky in his family of Judy, his wife, his sons and daughter, and his grandson, the television actor.

Before joining the Agriculture Committee staff in 1975, Bob served for many years at the Department of Agriculture. In the USDA's general counsel's office, he became an expert and experienced hand at matters dealing mainly with foreign agricultural affairs and domestic commodity programs.

There are many reasons we will miss Bob at the Agriculture Committee. We will miss his wise counsel. We will miss his calm and his command of the com-



plex affairs we deal with. We will miss his ability to work with men and women from every field and from many countries. Most of all, we will miss his companionship and his friendship.

If there is a saving grace to Bob's departure, it is the fact that we know he will still be active in the field of agriculture. I and other members of the Agriculture Committee, and the staff people who worked with him, wish Bob well in his new career in the private practice of law. I know it will be a successful career—because I know Bob Bor.

#### INTRODUCING H.R. 1916, TO ADDRESS THE SOCIAL SECURITY NOTCH

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation which addresses the Social Security benefit disparity commonly referred to as the "notch." The bill is appropriately designated as H.R. 1916.

I am sure the Members of this body are fully aware of the gross inequities in benefit payments which have resulted from the benefit formula change signed into law in 1977 by former President Carter. That piece of legislation, the 1977 Social Security Financing Amendments, was intended to prevent what was then a benefit overcompensation problem. Instead, however, the so-called solution has a completely unfair and penalizing effect between benefits paid to individuals who have similar work records but were born only 1 year, 1 month, in some cases just 1 day apart.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that, like me, many of my colleagues have been concerned about the notch problem since its inequities became clearly evident early in 1982; 1982 was the year that those who were born in 1917 and worked until age 65 were able to take their long-awaited retirement and began receiving their Social Security benefits. They were looking forward to a rewarding and worry-free retirement.

This is not the case, however. As these newly retired citizens began to receive their benefits, they learned that regardless of their work records, their benefits would be calculated under a different formula than those who were born a year before them. Hence their benefits are now substantially lower even though they may have retired only a year later.

Mr. Speaker, had the 1977 formula been designed in a fashion enabling retirees born after 1916 to receive benefits which were more consistent with those of their older coworkers, we would not need to address this issue

once again. It is also an issue which could have been addressed during the 98th Congress. In the last Congress, 126 Members of the House of Representatives had sponsored various bills which were authored to address the notch. Yet still, the problem persists and the victims cry out for relief.

It is not easy, Mr. Speaker, to explain to an individual who has worked hard all his or her life why an older neighbor, perhaps with a similar or even less impressive work record, should receive up to \$100 or more in Social Security benefits per month. And \$100 per month equals \$1,200 per year, a considerable amount of money considering that most of these people are dependent on fixed pension incomes. It is not right for us to ask the younger person, simply due to his or her date of birth, to accept the tremendous benefit disparity. It is not fair for us, as a nation proud of its quest for equality, to allow this inequity to continue.

Mr. Speaker, as responsible leaders, elected to represent the interests of our constituents and to promote their welfare, we must commit ourselves to further investigating this benefit disparity and acting to bring justice to those who have become victims of the notch.

Mr. Speaker, I have been corresponding regularly during the past 2 years with nearly 2,000 residents of the Fourth Congressional District of New Jersey who are affected by the notch. These Americans were children during the Great Depression and heroes of the World War II era. They have contributed so much to the success of our Nation. Must they endure yet another hardship brought upon them by their own leaders? Their effort, their dedication, and their work for this Nation is embedded in our universal recognition as a world leader. We cannot shadow their contributions now. We cannot ignore this inequity.

The bill I introduced yesterday, H.R. 1916, outlines steps for developing recommendations to remedy the disparity in the computation of Social Security benefits awarded persons born after 1916. I urge my colleagues to support this bill as a way to alleviate the notch problem and insure that all our senior citizens are fairly compensated for their lifetime contributions to our great country.

#### AID TO CENTRAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. IRELAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to begin a discussion with my colleagues in the House which will continue over the next several weeks. Mr. Speaker, following the Easter

recess we will consider assistance to our neighbors in Central America.

My remarks here will be short but I ask that my complete statement on aid to Central America be printed in its entirety.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we must view aid to Central America on the basis of an assumption fundamental to our democratic society: There is no ideology more foreign to this hemisphere than that of the Communist state.

In Nicaragua today we very clearly have a Soviet-Cuban backed Marxist-Leninist regime. We have evidence of a military buildup in Nicaragua unprecedented in any other Central American nation. Refugees are fleeing by the thousands and the elections which were held were a sham.

The promises of the revolution of 1979 for a pluralistic society—a non-aligned foreign policy—and elections have been denied. What the Sandinistas have done in Nicaragua is a tragedy, and their behavior toward others, their neighbors, is no better.

We, the Members of the U.S. Congress, must come to grips with the reality of the situation—Nicaragua poses a direct threat to the security of our Nation. To fail at this time to provide the necessary aid will surely bring chaos and instability to the entire region and seriously diminish the ability of the United States to influence events in our own hemisphere and the world.

The regime in Managua is lying to us just like it lied to the OAS despite that organization's willingness, in an unprecedented move prior to the overthrow of the Somoza dictatorship in July 1979, to recognize the coalition fighting against the government.

The United States has persistently raised four points with the Sandinistas in its bilateral talks at Manzanillo. These are the same points which lie at the heart of the multilateral Contadora negotiations.

First, we want Nicaragua to cease its support for insurgencies in other countries.

Second, we want the national directorate to adhere to the principles of the OAS Charter, and to honor the promises made in 1979 in return for OAS recognition of it as a transitional government.

Third, we want Nicaragua to reduce the size of its military to parity with that of its neighbors, and to refrain altogether from obtaining or seeking advanced military technology. The economies of Central America cannot afford an arms race. Nor can the democracies of Central America thrive in the face of a military threat from a state located in the heart of their region.

Finally, we want to see a reduction in Nicaraguan dependence on the Soviets, the Cubans, and clients like the

PLO or Libya. Neither the United States nor any other nation in the hemisphere can tolerate another Soviet military outpost. One Cuba in the Caribbean is more than enough.

I ask my colleagues to think about these facts. Nicaragua has not lived up to its commitments to the OAS nor does it plan to honor the four conditions discussed with the United States and the Contadora group which I have just mentioned.

In fact, we know its expansive military policies are continuing as are its close ties with the Soviet Union and Cuba. It is providing material, financial, and political support to insurgents in El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, and Guatemala.

At the same time, we are being asked by the Managua regime to believe their propaganda that the freedom fighters are really nothing more than henchmen of former President Somoza. We are being asked to shape U.S. foreign policy on the basis of information supplied by the Sandinistas who have not lived up to one of their commitments since overthrowing the previous regime.

The facts clearly demonstrate that nearly all the so-called Contra leaders were actually staunch opponents of Somoza. Many fought against Somoza and contributed to his defeat.

What has really happened to them is that they became discouraged and disillusioned when they saw that the democratic revolution—for which they had sacrificed so much—was being transformed into a Marxist-Leninist dictatorship.

The key to U.S. policy in Central America is to create conditions under which Nicaragua becomes a peaceful and democratic member of the Central American community.

Our overall goals are to: Support economic development; promote the security of threatened nations; encourage negotiations among the countries of the region that will serve the interests of the democratic process; support democratic governments where they exist; and help countries in the process of becoming democracies.

We cannot expect to meet these goals if Nicaragua continues in the stranglehold of communism. We cannot expect Nicaragua to stand independently and free if we do not help to create a climate which promotes a pluralistic society, allowing alternative points of view and democratic institutions.

If we do nothing, or if we insist upon doing very little, then we can be guaranteed of failure. But if we choose instead to review the facts—to take an honest look at the situation—then we can provide a measure of hope to those that ask for our assistance and seek the freedom of a democratic society.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the full text of my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. ANDY IRELAND  
REGARDING AID TO CENTRAL AMERICA

In 1947, President Harry Truman said that it should be American policy to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. It is exactly this principle that is being tested today in Central America, for there is no ideology more foreign to this hemisphere than that of the communist state.

In light of this fundamental assumption, I contend that a negative vote on assistance to the Nicaraguan freedom fighters will send a message to the Sandinista regime and its Soviet and Cuban backers that we accept the consolidation of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Nicaragua and we are unconcerned with the threat that it poses to our other Central American neighbors and to the security of the United States.

I do firmly believe that it is the security of the United States that we are talking about here. As such, each and everyone of you must review the facts, listen to reason, and strike a blow for freedom that will be heard around the world, by approving assistance to those fighting for freedom and democracy in Central America.

Let's review some of the facts for a moment.

The National Bipartisan Commission on Central America, the so-called Kissinger Commission, warned us early last year, in reporting its conclusions, that the crisis in Central America is acute. It requires our immediate attention. We do have a fundamental interest in the Central American region—interests which are now seriously threatened by the Soviet-Cuban successes in Nicaragua. If we do not respond positively and quickly, we will find ourselves compelled to commit to substantial increases in economic and military assistance in order to protect our vital security interests in the region.

In addition, further increases in Soviet influence in our Hemisphere will not only require greater commitment of our resources, but will threaten our shipping lanes in the region, result in increased violence in the area, and perhaps, most importantly, erode our power to influence events worldwide. We will be perceived as being unable and/or unwilling to influence events in our own sphere.

We are currently the target of a specious public relations campaign by the Sandinista regime intended to shape U.S. foreign policy in the region and to discredit the freedom fighters.

The Sandinistas call them "counter-revolutionaries". They denounce the leaders of the armed anti-Sandinista organizations as henchmen of former President Somoza. But, the facts clearly demonstrate that nearly all the so-called "contra" leaders were actually staunch opponents of Somoza. Many fought against Somoza and contributed to his defeat. What really happened to them is that they became disillusioned when they saw that the democratic revolution—for which they had sacrificed so much—was being transformed by the Sandinistas into a Marxist-Leninist dictatorship.

For too long, the debate over whether or not we provide assistance to our friends in Central America has been cluttered with these kinds of lies and disinformation, sent to us compliments of the Sandinista regime

in Managua. They have lied to the OAS and they are now lying to us.

Let me cite just a few examples:

In June, 1979, the Organization of American States [OAS], in an unprecedented move, recognized the coalition fighting against the repressive dictatorship of Anastasio Somoza. The most pervasive argument for this move was the coalition's promises to establish a pluralistic society with a mixed economy, to hold early elections, and to pursue a nonaligned foreign policy.

In July, 1979, the coalition which represented every major sector of Nicaraguan society—including organized labor, private business, and the Catholic Church—overthrew the Somoza dictatorship. Many Nicaraguans and supporters of the revolution in other countries had high hopes that the new government would improve the lives of all the country's citizens.

The Sandinista government, heir of the coalition, has violated these promises made to the OAS and to the Nicaraguan people because of the policies of the National Directorate of the Sandinista National Liberation Front [FSLN]. The FSLN's nine Marxist-Leninist revolutionary leaders, declaring themselves the "vanguard of the revolution", have imposed their programs on the government and the people of Nicaragua.

To consolidate their power, the Sandinistas, with Soviet and Cuban help, have established a pervasive security apparatus and auxiliary organizations. The resulting repression has caused tens of thousands of Nicaraguans to flee their homeland. This level of emigration is clear evidence that the "pluralistic society" promised by the revolution does not exist.

The Sandinista military build-up has exceeded all legitimate defensive needs. Since 1979, the army has swollen from about 6,000 to 119,000 with 62,000 of those on active duty.

In addition, the Sandinistas have amassed a total of 150 tanks and 200 armored vehicles. They have also received 13 helicopters, including at least five MI-24 gunships, the top of the line Soviet assault helicopter. These aircraft give the Sandinistas the ability to strike targets deep in Costa Rica and Honduras.

This Soviet supported surge in Sandinista military expansion, along with Nicaragua's continued support of Marxist-Leninist guerrillas operating in neighboring countries, has thoroughly disrupted the balance of power in Central America and violates its commitment to the OAS to pursue a non-aligned foreign policy.

In addition, the November 4, 1984 elections in Nicaragua were seriously flawed and did not confer legitimacy upon the Sandinista regime. The Sandinistas refused to grant the minimal conditions for the democratic parties to participate and thus faced only token opposition on election. Again, these actions are counter to the promises made to the OAS.

The United States has persistently raised four points with the Sandinistas in its bilateral talks at Manzanillo. These are the same points which lie at the heart of the multilateral Contadora negotiations.

First, we want Nicaragua to cease its support for insurgencies in other countries.

Second, we want the National Directorate to adhere to the principles of the OAS Charter, and to honor the promises made in 1979 in return for OAS recognition as a transitional government.

Third, we want Nicaragua to reduce the size of its military to parity with that of its



neighbors, and to refrain altogether from obtaining or seeking advanced military technology. The economies of Central America cannot afford an arms race spurred by Nicaragua's bid for supremacy. The democracies of Central America cannot thrive in the face of a military threat from a state located in the heart of their region.

Finally, we want to see a reduction in Nicaraguan dependence on the Soviets, the Cubans, and clients like the PLO or Libya. Neither this nation nor any other nation in the hemisphere can tolerate another Soviet military outpost. One Cuba in the Caribbean is more than enough.

I ask my colleagues to think about these facts. Nicaragua has not lived up to its commitments to the OAS nor does it plan to honor the four conditions discussed with the United States and the Contadora group which I have just mentioned. In fact, we know its expansive military policies are continuing as are its close ties with the Soviet Union and Cuba. It is providing material, financial, and political support to insurgents in El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, and Guatemala. This support takes the form of arms, ammunition, communications, coordination, logistics, training, propaganda, medical assistance and advice.

Why or how, then, can we be expected to believe the current propaganda campaign intended to discredit the freedom fighters?

Can the Sandinistas possibly have any credibility left after repeatedly violating their agreement with the OAS and their own people?

The key to U.S. policy in Central America is to create conditions under which Nicaragua becomes a peaceful and democratic member of the Central American community.

Our overall goals are to: Support economic development; promote the security of threatened nations; encourage negotiations among the countries of the region that will serve the interests of the democratic process; support democratic governments where they exist; and help countries in the process of becoming democracies.

We cannot expect to meet these goals if Nicaragua continues in the stranglehold of communism. We cannot expect Nicaragua to stand independently and free if we do not help to create a climate which promotes a pluralistic society, allowing alternative points of view and democratic institutions.

What the Sandinistas have done in Nicaragua is a tragedy, and their behavior toward others, their neighbors, is no better. We must come to grips with the reality of the situation—doing anything less shortchanges our responsibilities as a leader of the free world.

If we do nothing, or if we insist upon doing very little, then we can be guaranteed of failure. But if we choose instead to review the facts—to take an honest look at the situation—then we can provide a measure of hope to those that ask for our assistance and seek the freedom of a democratic society.

It is in this spirit that we seek the views of the American people in an open public discussion of the issues. It will provide an opportunity to review our present policy and address the concerns of citizens as expressed by those living in the State of Florida.

Next week in my district I plan to meet with my constituents and present them with the facts of the case on the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua. It is my contention that given the correct information, the American people will opt for assistance to

Central America so that we can continue to ensure that our Hemisphere does not become dominated by the likes of the Soviet-Cuban alliance we see today in Nicaragua.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. IRELAND] has expired.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask for an additional 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman that he cannot request additional time under a 5-minute special order.

The gentleman's time has expired.

□ 2030

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE 1985 FARM BILL ALTERNATIVE, H.R. 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation representing in its membership a large number of farmers and ranchers throughout the United States. H.R. 1965 is obviously the product of a substantial amount of work, no doubt certain compromises, and represents a reasonable, pragmatic proposal that deserves the strong consideration of those in Congress and the administration who will participate in constructing a 1985 Farm Act that will be put in place for at least the next 4 years. It is an alternative 1985 farm bill proposal that I commend to all Members for their perusal and their active support—where possible.

Agriculture and its related industries are today in the midst of a very critical time. Many of our farmers are facing tremendous difficulties. Alarming numbers of them are caught between heavy indebtedness and low prices, and virtually all are suffering from an inadequate return on the substantial investments they've made in order to produce food and fiber for us, and for a major part of the world's population.

That production, Mr. Speaker, must continue—but it must continue in a way that allows real profitability to return to the family farm. In that regard, I think we have reached a consensus—both here in Washington and out in farm country—that our present Federal farm programs are not moving us in that direction.

In short, we are approaching this year's rewrite of farm bill with a growing awareness that what we have now isn't working. After 50 years of direct Federal involvement in the agriculture economy, those commodities that have received the most help remain, in some respects, today the ones with the worst marketing and income problems. And from that realization, the farm

community and its Representatives in Congress have largely come to agree that change is needed.

To that end, I believe that the 1985 farm bill must allow our farmers to eventually move closer to the marketplace, while at the same time providing needed protection against the highly unfavorable market conditions that exist today and will not go away tomorrow.

Thus far, the only blueprint for this change we have seen is the administration's proposed farm bill. While the goal of this proposal is perhaps a good one, I think its timetable is too ambitious. Allowing our farmers and ranchers to work their way back to solid ground will take time, and the farm bill we enact must allow that time, and provide a bridge to that farm economy in the future that can be more self-reliant.

Likewise, if our farmers and ranchers are to move closer to the market, we have a great deal of work to do in order to make those markets ones in which they can compete fairly and profitably. The key to that, of course, lies in our farm exports, and our farm bill must contain substantive provisions for promoting these exports.

Again, the administration's farm bill proposal contains such provisions, but probably does not do enough in terms of export promotion.

A few weeks ago, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Nation's largest general farm organization, unveiled a carefully worked out alternative to both our existing farm programs, and the administration's proposal. In terms of laying a path for positive change in Federal farm programs, while protecting our farmers against the consequences of moving too quickly, I believe this proposed farm bill represents a reasonable, realistic option that deserves our most serious consideration. It is for that reason that I am introducing this proposal, and in doing so, laying it on the table to serve as a good starting point from which we can develop the best possible farm bill.

In addition to maintaining reasonable price and income safeguards for our producers, this proposal reflects the strong emphasis on increased exports and soil conservation that I believe must be included in the farm bill. Among the export provisions is a commodity bonus feature in which portions of commodities in CCC storage would be offered as a bonus to those who buy our products on the world market.

Likewise, the bill includes a 7- to 15-year conservation reserve program aimed at converting erosion-prone land now in crop production to less intensive uses. This, along with a provision linking eligibility for farm program benefits with nonproduction on

fragile lands, will go a long way toward addressing our critical soil loss problem.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, like any other existing proposal, is not perfect. Individual provisions will not be satisfactory to everyone—and it does not represent a cure-all for the problems of the farm economy. In fact, I think it is important to point out that the things that will help agriculture the most—lower deficits, fair trade, and a stable world economy—are not things we can provide in a farm bill. Yet, we must have a solid, realistic framework for our Federal farm programs if our farmers are to weather the present storm, and I believe that this proposal is an excellent place to start.

I and those who are cosponsoring this bill reserve the right to differ on specific points contained herein, and to refine our positions if circumstances so warrant as the general policies incorporated in this bill are translated into legislation that will be signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD, as prepared by representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation: First, a summary of the major provisions of the bill; second, a chart providing preliminary forecasts for target prices, loan rates, and so forth; and third, a series of questions and answers relating to the bill.

#### FARM BUREAU'S FARM BILL—1985: SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS

(As adopted by the AFBF Board of Directors, March 4-5)

##### I. AGRICULTURAL EXPORT EXPANSION AND PUBLIC LAW 480

Provides for an export commodity bonus program to offset the use of export subsidies by competing countries and the U.S. trade disadvantages being experienced because of currency exchange relationships. This provision would help regain foreign markets and reduce CCC and farmer-owned reserve stocks. The provisions of the cargo preference laws shall not apply to this program.

The Export Credit Revolving Fund would be activated and extended through 1989. Export sales financed or guaranteed under any CCC export credit program would be exempted from cargo preference laws.

Use of the intermediate credit program authorized under section 4 of the Food for Peace Act of 1966 is mandated.

The special standby export subsidy program is exempted from cargo preference laws.

To provide additional export outlets while helping meet the food needs of developing countries, the minimum tonnage to be shipped under titles I, II and III of PL 480 shall be 10 million tons (up from current levels of about 8 million tons). All PL 480 shipments would be exempted from cargo preference laws.

##### II. DAIRY

Milk shall be supported at such level equal to 90 percent of the simple average "all milk" price received by farmers for each of the preceding three years. This price

level shall be automatically revised effective October 1 of each of the years 1985 through 1989 except in the case of 1985 the price level revision shall occur on the first day of the month following enactment of the Agriculture Act of 1985. If the Secretary estimates that net government price support purchases of milk or the products of milk will be less than 5 billion pounds or in excess of 5.99 billion pounds he shall adjust the support price as determined in this subsection according to the following scale:

Net Government purchases	Percent of support price	Projected adjusted support price (as of 3/85)
Less than 3	104	12.46
3 to 3.99	103	12.34
4 to 4.99	102	12.22
5 to 5.99	100	11.98
6 to 6.99	98	11.74
7 to 7.99	96	11.50
More than 8		

\* If CCC purchases are projected to exceed 7.99 billion pounds milk equivalent during the next 12 months, the Secretary is given discretionary authority to adjust the support price by not more than 3 percent on April 1, 1986, and for any subsequent 6-month period.

##### III. LOAN LEVELS

For wheat, feed grains, and rice:

The Secretary shall make available to producers nonrecourse loans and purchases for each of the 1986 through 1989 crops at a level equal to 75 percent of the simple average domestic price received by farmers for each of the preceding five marketing years, excluding the high and low valued years; provided that the level of loans and purchases shall not be adjusted by more than 10 percent in any year, including the first year of such program.

For cotton (extend current loan formula):

The Secretary shall make available to producers nonrecourse loans and purchases for each of the 1986 through 1989 crops at the lower of:

(a) 85 percent of the average price (weighed by market and month) of such quality of cotton quoted in the designated U.S. spot markets during three years of the five year period ending July, excluding the high and low valued years, or;

(b) 90 percent of the average announced of comparable cotton prices quoted C.I.F. Northern Europe for comparable U.S. cotton.

The current minimum loan level of 55 cents per pound is eliminated.

##### IV. TARGET PRICES/DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS FOR WHEAT, FEED GRAINS, COTTON, AND RICE

The target price in 1986 will be frozen at 1985 levels. Beginning in 1987, the target price shall be set at a level equal to 110 percent of the same average market prices used to determine the loan rates for the commodities but shall not be adjusted by more than 5 percent annually including 1987. Deficiency payments will be computed as under current law.

##### V. ACREAGE REDUCTION REQUIREMENT

When total carryover of wheat or feed grains exceeds four percent of annual world utilization, or when cotton carryover exceeds 3.5 million bales, or when the total supply of rice exceeds the normal supply by fifteen percent, the Secretary of Agriculture shall implement a voluntary acreage reduction program. Authority for acreage reduction and paid diversion programs shall be continued through the 1989 crop year.

##### VI. ADVANCE DIVERSION PAYMENTS

If the Secretary of Agriculture makes land diversion payments as provided for in the Agriculture Act of 1985 to assist in adjusting the acreage of the 1986, 1987, 1988, or 1989 crop of wheat, feed grains, cotton or rice, at least 50 percent of such a land diversion payment shall be made available to a producer as soon as possible after the producer agrees to undertake the diversion of land in return for the payment.

##### VII. SOYBEANS

The current loan formula is retained for soybeans with no additional authority for acreage reduction or deficiency payments.

##### VIII. SUGAR

The Secretary shall support the price of domestically grown sugarcane through non-recourse loans at appropriate levels but not less than 18 cents per pound for the 1986 through 1989 crops of sugar. Sugar beet loan levels shall be set at levels that are fair and reasonable in relation to the level of loans for sugarcane.

##### IX. WOOL AND MOHAIR

Wool and mohair titles will remain substantially the same as under the 1981 Act.

##### X. PEANUTS

The peanut program would be continued at current support price levels.

The peanut quota will be established at the level of the previous three years average of domestic edible and seed use with annual modifications made by the Secretary not to exceed 5 percent.

Future changes in quota loan levels would be modified only to reflect the percentage change in the prices paid index of the previous two years.

##### XI. FARMER-OWNED RESERVE

The farmer-owned grain reserve will be terminated and replaced by loans to wheat and feed grain producers to be made available without interest for a nine month period. A nine month extension will be made available which will include a charge for interest.

##### XII. PAYMENT LIMITATIONS FOR DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS

The total amount of deficiency payments (excluding disaster payments) that a person shall be entitled to receive under one or more of the annual programs established under this act for wheat, feed grains upland cotton, and rice shall be limited to \$50,000 for each of the 1986 through 1989 crop years. The term "payments" as used in this section shall not include loans or purchases or any part of any payment that is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to represent compensation for resource adjustment or public access for recreation.

##### XIII. CONSERVATION RESERVE AND SODBUSTER

The Secretary of Agriculture must provide for a conservation reserve program for owners and operators of erosion-prone land to assist them in conserving soil consistent with budgetary limitations. Contracts of seven to fifteen years would be offered under which producers would convert erosion-prone cropland to less intensive uses such as pasture, permanent grass, legumes or trees.

Any producer who brings fragile land into production shall be ineligible for any farm programs benefits on any crop in his entire farming operation.

The following chart illustrates changes in target prices, loan rates and deficiency payments for wheat; feedgrain, cotton and rice



under the proposed Farm Bureau Farm Bill. These run only through 1987 since certain variables make projection beyond that point difficult.

THESE FIGURES ARE PRELIMINARY FORECAST ESTIMATES AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE BASED UPON FURTHER ANALYSIS

	1985	1986	1987
Wheat:			
Target.....	4.38	4.38	4.16
Loan.....	3.30	2.97	2.67
Maximum deficiency payment.....	1.08	1.41	1.49
Feed grains (example corn):			
Target.....	3.03	3.03	2.93
Loan.....	2.55	2.30	2.07
Maximum deficiency payment.....	.48	.73	.86
Cotton per lb:			
Target.....	.81	.81	.77
Loan.....	N/A	N/A	N/A
Maximum deficiency payment.....	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rice cwt:			
Target.....	11.90	11.90	11.31
Loan.....	8.00	7.20	6.48
Maximum deficiency payment.....	3.90	4.70	4.83

Preliminary forecast estimates show the cost of the four year Farm Bureau Farm Bill at about \$27.1 billion, or an average of about \$6.8 billion per year.

#### THE FARM BUREAU FARM BILL—MOST ASKED QUESTIONS

(Farm Bureau has been involved in a year-long study of issues involved in the 1985 farm bill that Congress will have to consider this session and has proposed legislation that will improve farm earning opportunities.

(Here are some of the most frequently asked questions about the proposed 1985 Farm Bill. All bear heavily on the keys to the right type of a farm program, market orientation, trade compatibility, income protection and fiscal responsibility.)

**Won't the Farm Bureau farm program mean lower farm prices?**

Farm prices move up and down over time. The purpose of the down side of any market is to expand consumption and reduce the incentives of competitors to produce products that are in excess supply.

Many farmers are not satisfied with the commodity prices they received after the 1983 PIK program and the drought. These major events clearly illustrate that it is beyond the ability of government to force commodity prices up and keep them up without laying the foundation for more inflation, higher taxes, higher farm input costs, interest rates, debt and further farm consolidations.

While lawmakers were trying to push prices up for major crops, the livestock industry was forced to make major adjustments without government help.

**Will the Farm Bureau farm program mean fewer farmers?**

The Farm Bureau plan is not skewed toward more or fewer farms. Farm programs in place since the 1930's have not stopped the decline in the number of farms and farmers. Changes in the number and size of farms will continue to be influenced by technological advances and economic efficiency. This will benefit commercial agriculture and consumers.

**Is the Farm Bureau farm bill the "free market" alternative?**

No. A "free market" alternative would eliminate all direct income and price subsidies and all indirect subsidies for production and marketing research, disease and pest control. Farm Bureau's proposal does not eliminate all government price intervention and involvement in farming and ranching.

Farm Bureau supports a continuation of present farm programs but with modifications to regain market share, eliminate excess inventories, reduce taxpayer costs and improve economic balance among crops and between crops and livestock.

This bill simply relates government price supports more to the market, less to political actions which have actually intensified many current farm difficulties.

**How will the Farm Bureau farm bill help overall farm income?**

If farm programs are more related to markets and less dependent on political decisions, U.S. farmers will stop losing market shares and income opportunities to foreign producers. The policy supports economic growth for agriculture and increased opportunities for income.

Marginal farm acreages in Europe, Canada, Australia, Argentina and the United States will be reduced. Only then can U.S. producers regain their competitive position.

**Will there be cost savings?**

This bill calls for reduced farm program spending. This approach gives farmers more credibility in calling for spending reductions in other entitlement programs.

The most important benefit for individual farmers in the longer term will be to bring interest rates down. Farm costs will be under less inflationary pressure and the overall economy will be on a better foundation for longer term growth, more trade and increased farm exports.

**Why doesn't this proposed legislation support mandatory production controls to raise farm prices?**

Farm prices ultimately reflect the interaction of supply and demand around the world, not just supply in the United States. Whenever the U.S. mandated production controls while trying to sustain politically favorable but unrealistic farm prices, production increased in foreign countries. Our markets were lost when acreage reduction programs were instituted in the U.S. When markets are lost they are difficult to regain.

Mandatory production controls have not worked in the past. Both production and marketing opportunities have been lost for commodities where this approach has been used.

Mandatory controls in the U.S. would signal foreign producers to expand production and sales of food and fiber while U.S. farmers reduce output and carry stocks and U.S. taxpayers pick up the costs of much of the world's farm programs. U.S. farmers would be restricted to producing for only the domestic market.

Mandatory controls would mean production allotments and/or marketing quotas. Ultimately, government would decide farming opportunities. Producers would lose the opportunity to produce. Producers would likely lose one-third or more of the present crop acreage of feedgrains, wheat, soybeans, cotton and rice.

**Where is the income opportunity for U.S. farmers in the world market?**

World demand for food and fiber will increase in the years ahead but not at the artificially high rates of growth experienced

during the 1970's. Increased population and higher incomes in "middle income" countries present income opportunities for U.S. farmers. Those people with increased incomes will upgrade their diets.

**What about domestic demand?**

Demand in the U.S. is growing very slowly. With the expansion of cost-reducing technology, the only viable income opportunity is to produce and sell larger volumes in the world market.

**What are the objectives of the Farm Bureau farm program proposal?**

Basically the objectives are threefold: (1) increase market shares and income opportunities; (2) encourage more efficient and balanced use of farm resources within farms and among farming regions; and (3) reduce taxpayer cost.

These objectives will be met by:

1. Loan rates for major crops tied to world market prices to insure that U.S. products will be price competitive. This will, in turn, give a signal to other export competitors that we will compete and not hold a price umbrella over the market.

2. Resources organized on farms and among regions for market opportunity rather than government program opportunity.

3. Taxpayer costs reduced by increased market opportunities and eliminating the market disruption and taxpayer costs of the federal farmer-held reserve.

**Will this farm bill favor one commodity over another when it becomes law?**

No. Current programs are out of economic balance. Wheat, for example, is not priced as a feedstuff. But, with 100 bushels per acre wheat on more and more farms, wheat must be fed periodically to keep stocks from building. Feeding more wheat would be better for corn producers when droughts occur because a larger livestock industry would be maintained. Feed prices would not experience the severe run-ups that hurt the livestock industry and eventually reduce feedgrain consumption.

With all loan rates made more responsive to market prices, farm resources would be better utilized over time. This means that there would be less incentive for supply reduction programs year after year as has been the experience with wheat, rice and cotton.

**What causes production imbalance?**

Supply reduction programs put severe pressure on farmers to increase production of "nonfarm program" crops such as fruits and vegetables. For example, the repeated reduction in tobacco quotas has caused more and more tobacco farmers to raise vegetables. Sooner or later this government-induced vegetable production causes problems for vegetable producers outside tobacco raising areas.

Livestock producers will benefit from more market responsive loan rates for wheat, feedgrains, cotton, rice and soybeans.

The 800 million acres of rangeland and pasture in the U.S. that are not suitable for crop production will better maintain their value. Without farm program changes, rangeland agriculture will continue to decline as government guaranteed grain prices and production reduction programs raise cost of meat production and ultimately reduce consumer demand.

**How will farmers and the nation benefit from this farm bill proposal?**

Farmers will benefit by taking action to stop the erosion of their markets and thus position themselves for increased market income opportunities in the future.

Farmers will also benefit by getting control of federal spending in order to bring interest rates down.

The nation will benefit since food will be produced and consumed, not produced and stored. The economy will benefit from continued productivity gains by farmers. Taxpayers will benefit through reduced program costs and less pressure on the Federal Reserve to pursue inflationary money policies.

*How will this farm bill differ from present farm programs?*

This proposal will allow decisions about prices to be made more by market participants rather than set by politicians and bureaucrats.

Present programs are basically the accumulation of several years of election year political tinkering with farm pricemaking.

This proposal will not eliminate political intervention in farm prices, but it will be more difficult for candidates to promise farmers more income from taxpayers and consumers than market prices are signaling.

Tying loan rates for major commodities to markets would be a farm policy "watershed" without doing away with farm program benefits. This policy recognizes that U.S. farmers live in a world market for agricultural products.

This program will be a major step in correcting the farm economic policy mistakes made in the 1977 and 1981 farm laws by favoring production for use, not for storage.

*Will lower target prices mean reduced incentives for producers to participate in voluntary supply reduction programs?*

Yes. But the target price concept was never intended as an incentive to cut production. The target price is an income support program. This proposal keeps the original purpose intact. Congress will have to decide how much income to transfer to farmers.

Under this proposal, supply reductions will not be needed on a regular basis. When they are needed, Congress will have the pay for them by reducing some other area of federal spending.

*How will livestock producers benefit from this farm program?*

Feed is a major expense for beef, pork, lamb, poultry and egg producers. Farm programs over the years have favored crop production only. By raising the cost of feed to the livestock industry, federal farm programs have encouraged increased specialization in crops due to reduced price risk and have injured livestock producers by artificially increasing grain prices.

Increased specialization in crop production and away from crop and livestock production on farms has led to more political intervention to increase crop prices when markets weakened.

Farm programs have affected not only the cost of feed but also its availability by favoring storage and acreage reduction programs over production and use.

With consumers apparently making some fundamental shifts in red meat consumption, livestock producers cannot absorb the impact of federal farm programs that raise production costs and prices to consumers. Without policy realignment between crops and livestock, the U.S. livestock industry will continue to decline.

*How will this bill correct the problems with the farmer-held, government-managed grain reserve?*

That's pretty simple. The farmer-held reserve will be abolished.

The reserve was started in 1977 in response to political pressure for food reserves. As expected, the reserve quickly became a convenient device for federal farm program managers to take grain out of market channels at home and abroad in an attempt to raise grain prices. In the meantime, with markets shorted and inflated prices, livestock producers were whipsawed and foreign buyers found grain elsewhere.

The Farm Bureau bill eliminate the reserve and replaces it with a simple extension of the regular nine-month loan program. The additional nine-month loan period, with interest paid, would let the market determine grain stocks, not federal farm program managers. Consumers will be served since grain will be produced and used, not stored. Taxpayers would benefit by not having to pick up the tab for storing huge quantities of grain.

This bill will eliminate one of the worst historical farm program initiatives—stockpiling grain.

*How will this bill solve the dairy problem?*

By tying government-guaranteed dairy prices to the market price, producers will get a better signal from consumers. This basic signal has been lost for several years.

With dairy technologies pushing per unit milk production costs downward, there are new opportunities for expanding the utilization of milk products.

Unless dairy price supports are consistent with market reality, farmers will be pushed to mandatory controls since government stocks of dairy products are certain to mount after the diversion program expires.

#### BETHANY L. GOLDBERG'S "MY PLEDGE TO AMERICA" ESSAY WINS FOR STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] is recognized for 5 minutes. ● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, each year the U.S. Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary conduct the Voice of Democracy script writing contest. This year more than 300,000 secondary school students participated in the contest competing for the six national scholarships which are annually awarded as top prizes. The contest theme this year was "My Pledge to America."

I would like to take this opportunity to submit to the RECORD this year's winning script from the State of Rhode Island. Its author is Bethany L. Goldberg who lives at 8 Cedar Lane in Warren, RI. Bethany is the daughter of Palmer and Sandra Goldberg. She is a senior at Warren High School where she serves as a representative to the student council and is a member of the National Honor Society.

I join in with the residents of Rhode Island's First Congressional District in saluting Bethany for such an outstanding achievement. Her essay reads as follows:

MY PLEDGE TO AMERICA  
(By Bethany L. Goldberg)

As a young American, I boast of the origin of my country. America's forefathers accom-

plished so much with faith, determination, stamina and hardships. Therefore, I now pledge to play my role in maintaining and in improving this great country for which the Pilgrims endured many difficulties and survived. Americans today must also persevere so that their children and their children's children will live in even a better world. Undoubtedly, more than faith alone may be necessary. Pilgrims had faith that they could establish a nation that offered life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. As the English dramatist, George Bernard Shaw taught us, creation begins with imagination. "You imagine what you desire; you will what you imagine; and at last you create what you will." Like the Pilgrims, I intend to keep burning that same torch of liberty with diligence throughout critical times. To preserve American freedom, I and other American citizens today must act with the same devotion to principle, the same fidelity to duty; because America symbolizes the mighty guardian of human liberty, of equal justice, and of universal brotherhood.

Although I as a young American have yet to vote, I am well informed about people seeking to lead America. Knowing their qualifications, I reach decisions. Then I urge and influence eligible voting citizens in my community to vote and to support the best people for my government. As President Abraham Lincoln said, "Voting is the people's business. The election is in their hands. If they turn their backs to the fire and get scorched in the rear, they'll find they have got to sit on the blister." Therefore, I will always cherish the right to vote, the right for which many Americans have sacrificed their lives. I realize that government is only as good as its leaders and its leaders are only as good as its citizens demand. Therefore, I pledge to support those persons who I believe will guarantee good government and the quest for excellence.

Basically, my pledge to America is to be a good citizen. When I rear my family, I will to the best of my ability attempt to perpetuate America's democratic ideals. At the present time, I maintain a sense of respect as an individual and a sense of family, appreciating the community and respecting the nation as a whole. I am aware of America's laws and privileges in the Bill of Rights and in the Constitution. For these privileges as a young American I am thankful. By obeying always the laws and also doing my best to insure that others abide, I demonstrate my good citizenship. In fact, everyday in school I display loyalty and patriotism with these words: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America..." Pledging my allegiance to the flag declares my respect for what the stars and stripes symbolize—our indivisible nation which guarantees liberty and justice for all. I will even fulfill my duty to fight for my country in time of need by serving in a military force. Desiring to help govern my country, I will furthermore willingly accept the challenge of jury duty in the future. Above all, I hope to discover all my talents and to make use of both my talents and my opportunities to benefit me and my country to the optimum.

At this moment, I pledge to obtain the best education possible for myself. As a well-educated person, I shall become a worthwhile and contributing member of American society. As a knowledgeable person, I shall do my part to insure that all Americans have the opportunity stated in the Constitution that guarantees the pursuit of happi-



ness by attempting to eliminate poverty, illiteracy and human suffering. In an age of advanced technology, I shall do my part in endeavoring to maintain the spark of humanity and individuality to keep society from becoming too impersonal. I and other Americans must remain cognizant of the human touch and keep faith in worthiness of humanity. In essence, I shall persist in helping America perpetuate the principles of democracy and freedom and preserving these ideals stipulated in the Constitution, so coveted by America's forefathers.

Moreover, in this age of "star wars," I must preserve the resources of the planet Earth. I must maintain respect for the water, the air, the trees, and all other natural resources. Mostly, I must retain faith in humanity. I must cherish what is best, and take what is good and strive to make life better. In the winter of my life, I hope I can reminisce knowing that because of my personal contributions to humanity, I have left America the greatest Nation in the world.●

#### CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO URGES HALT TO DEFAMATION OF ETHNIC GROUPS BY MASS MEDIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 4, a bill I introduced at the opening of the 99th Congress, would put the Congress on record in opposition to films and television or radio broadcasts which defame, stereotype, demean, or degrade ethnic, racial, or religious groups.

As an American and the son of Italian immigrants, I am only too well acquainted with the innuendos, the sick jokes, and the countless other vicious, contemptible, and cruel methods employed by our mass media to degrade members of ethnic and minority groups. It is a tragic commentary upon our times that those ethnic groups and minorities which have managed to retain a vestige of their original national identity, while at the same time assimilating into democratic society and contributing mightily to the strength of our Nation, should be made to suffer most acutely by motion pictures, television programs, radio broadcasts, and periodicals which demean their identity.

Denigrating remarks about any group in our society concerning characteristics over which one has no control, such as race, ethnicity, or religion, are immoral in themselves. More importantly, though, and of particular interest to Congress, is that these characterizations strike at the very heart of a healthy and wholesome political system. My resolution recognizes that the vitality of our political institutions and our values are dependent on harmonious relationships among the various ethnic groups. Only if mutual respect is accorded to these

groups can our democracy grow stronger and more dynamic.

When the media allows and encourages aspersion to be cast upon groups, this disturbs social harmony and becomes a political concern. Groups that have been maligned cannot help but question the worth of their allegiance to a political system which seems to affirm attacks upon them.

Unfortunately, the motion picture, radio, and television industries have on occasion been less than diligent in their responsibility to help create a society in which individuals can respect their heritage, and throughout my career as a Member of the House of Representatives, I have called upon the Congress to take a leadership role in standing up against this ethnic denigration.

Supporters of my resolution do not want government censorship; they want the leaders in the media industry to exercise a social conscience in human relationships just as they want industries to exercise a social conscience in matters such as employment, pollution control, or pricing policies.

Stereotypes as presented on television can be particularly influential on young children. Whether in life or in the media, to a great degree, we become what we see. Children are influenced not only by what they are told to be, but also by observing what people, with whom they identify, are actually like or portrayed as being. Consequently, the challenge to the media is very great indeed, since the motion picture and broadcast media have become central to the American way of life and have profound influence, particularly on children. The television set is a perfect instrument for those who would spawn prejudice and prejudgment of our fellow human beings.

In the past when private industries defaulted in their social responsibilities, they were subjected to governmental regulation. My resolution simply calls for an evaluation and an accounting by the media industry a year after congressional passage to determine the adequacy of the code of ethics or the guidelines which they develop and apply under this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, with the immense influence that the media has today on our American way of life, a greater sensitivity must be encouraged in the depiction of ethnic and minority groups. The passage of my bill, House Concurrent Resolution 4, will go a long way toward the elimination of derogatory and defamatory materials which reinforce negative ethnic stereotypes, and I urge all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support this legislation.●

#### UPDATE ON HOUSE RECOUNT OF INDIANA EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated last week in a special order, it is my intention to keep the House fully informed of the progress of the House recount in the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana.

Last Wednesday, the task force on the Indiana Eighth Congressional District held a hearing here in Washington, DC. The hearing provided an opportunity for any interested party to inform the task force of his or her views regarding the recount process, and to establish a record regarding such views. We heard from numerous witnesses, including present and former Members of Congress, and from various citizens and legal experts. Without exception, the witnesses agreed that the House was authorized to conduct the recount pursuant to its constitutional duty to determine the elections and returns of its Members.

While the hearing was taking place in Washington, DC., the six House recount teams, headed by Arizona election official Jim Shumway, were counting ballots in the largest county in the Eighth Congressional District—Vanderburgh County. The Vanderburgh County recount was concluded on Thursday night, March 28, and the recount teams fanned out to begin the next two counties on the schedule early Friday morning.

That same Friday morning, the members of the task force convened for a hearing in the municipal building in Evansville, IN. The purpose of the hearing was to listen to the candidates, their lawyers, and the citizens and elections officials of the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana who were affected by the recount. Over a dozen witnesses appeared, and each made a contribution to the record.

In the afternoon, following the hearing in Evansville, the task force members traveled to Spencer County, where two of the recount teams were in the process of counting absentee paper ballots. After viewing the recount in progress, the task force reconvened for consideration of two ballots from Vanderburgh County, which had been segregated for task force consideration on the basis that they might contain "distinguishing marks."

Mr. Jim Shumway presented the ballots to the task force, and explained the peculiarities regarding each. The ballots were masked so that none of the members of the task force could observe for which candidates the ballots had been cast. This procedure was agreed to, and will be followed

throughout the recount, so that the task force members will have no prior knowledge or information pertinent to any particular ballot, which might in any way influence the totally objective determination of each member.

Because Mr. Shumway was appointed recount director unanimously by the task force, and is an experienced election official and expert in the field, I asked that he make a recommendation based upon his expertise regarding each ballot. After due deliberation, the task force unanimously agreed with each of the recommendations of the recount director, and the ballots were counted and added back into the totals. Following the determinations, the task force adjourned, and Mr. Shumway proceeded with the recount.

The counting continued on Saturday, March 30, allowing the House recount team to finish Spencer County. On Monday, the recount teams were again on the go in two counties, both of which were finished Monday night. Today two more counties were counted. Orange County was completed, and Gibson will be completed tomorrow. The schedule for the remainder of the week includes several additional counties.

Tomorrow at 3:30, the task force will again convene in Evansville, IN, to decide on 24 more ballots upon which there are marks. We will also receive a report on the efforts of the recount director to reconcile any discrepancies in the tally sheets which have arisen during the House recount. And we will discuss procedures which the task force might follow in reconciling discrepancies in vote tallies. Next week the task force will again convene in Evansville, IN, to reconcile whatever discrepancies are pending at that time.

The staff of the task force reports that the counting teams have been doing yeoman service, working the weekends and well into the nights. That was certainly my observation when I was there on Friday. The recount teams in Warrick County, for example, worked from early Friday morning until nearly 11 p.m. on Friday night. They then continued Saturday morning in Spencer County. The House is certainly being well served by the conscientious work of the recount director and the GAO auditors, who are making every effort to conclude the recount in the most expeditious manner consistent with accuracy. Having a count upon which the House can depend is certainly worth waiting for.

The recount director has indicated that his recount teams will conclude their work at some point next week. As soon as their work is completed, and the recount director has submitted his report, I will convene the task force forthwith to consider any matters needing resolution.

#### TRIBUTE TO PATRICIA HARRIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND] is recognized for 60 minutes.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, when Patricia Harris died the Washington Post said her career had been marked by many firsts.

She was the first black woman who served in a Presidential Cabinet; first as Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and then as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

She was the first black woman to become an ambassador.

She was the first black woman to become dean of a law school.

And she was the first black woman to serve as a delegate to the United Nations.

But despite all the prestige of her career, she never forgot the purpose of her life—to improve the quality of life for everyone.

At a Senate Banking Committee hearing when her empathy for the poor was questioned, she replied:

Senator, I am one of them. You do not seem to understand who I am. I am a black woman, the daughter of a dining car worker. I am a black woman who could not buy a house 8 years ago in parts of the District of Columbia. If you think I have forgotten that, you are dead wrong.

Such humility and honesty characterized Patricia Harris' life. She never shouted her contributions. Instead she diligently worked on behalf of those who had no opportunity; spoke for those with no political voice.

When social programs were being cut right and left, Patricia Harris stood firmly in support of her people. Through her efforts HEW's budget was not cut and, in fact, was increased by \$25 billion.

While others talked about giving women and minorities opportunity, Patricia Harris acted.

As Secretary of HUD, 50 percent of her political appointments were women and 28 percent were black or Hispanic. As Secretary of HHS 67 percent of her appointments were women and minorities.

While I am deeply saddened by the death of Patricia Harris, I refuse to dwell on this sadness. Rather, I prefer to think of the greatness she brought to all our lives by her quiet words and her tremendous works.

□ 2040

#### THE NATIONAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND], in his remarks in the tribute that he paid to Mrs. Harris.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a subject involving the economy.

The good news with the economy is that things look positive for 1985, following almost 2 years of lower unemployment, increased retail sales and housing starts, auto production up by 8 percent, inflation down and staying down, and interest rates in an affordable bracket.

The bad news is that it looks good because we have increased the national debt by 175 percent in the last 4 years, compared to President Nixon's debt increase of 11 percent, President Ford's increase of 59 percent and President Carter's increase of 49 percent.

From George Washington to Jimmy Carter, we built up a debt of \$980 billion. During the last 4 years, we have almost doubled that figure.

We ended 1984 by borrowing \$180 billion and as you pay your income tax this month, 13 cents of each tax dollar will go toward the 1984 interest on the national debt which is \$1.6 trillion and increasing.

This philosophy, which we have practiced for over 60 years, of spending more than our income, is a ticking time bomb, which can have terrible consequences on our country if we fail to take corrective action, not sometime soon, but right now.

I get the feeling that America is at the crossroads and that 1986 must be a turn around for this situation.

The danger signals are all around us. The Ohio Savings & Loan closings creating a sense of panic among its subscribers.

Right near my home in Perry, GA, the closing of Briggs & Stratton, laying off 200 workers primarily because of an imbalance of automobile foreign imports.

The President's budget for 1986, which we have been reviewing in the Congress, recognizes that we have problems.

The President's budget proposes that we freeze Federal spending at approximately the 1985 level.

But his proposal is not exactly a freeze, as it cuts and reduces some programs, eliminates some outright, freezes others, but allows defense to increase along with health for 1 year and Social Security COLA'S.

For instance, the administration would abolish FmHA, eliminate or



reduce farm subsidies, dispose of the EMC's, dismantle the SBA over a few years, reduce Federal salaries by 5 percent, reduce Medicare by \$18 billion over 5 years, discontinue revenue sharing to towns and cities and eliminate urban development action grants and other programs.

The Congress agrees with the President that we must cut spending by at least \$50 billion. But there is disagreement on how the cuts will be made.

The Senate Budget Committee proposes a freeze and accepting 75 percent of the President's cuts and reductions. This would amount to a savings of \$55 billion in 1986, \$99 billion in 1987, and \$141 billion in 1988.

The House Budget Committee seems to be working toward a nominal freeze at 1985 levels for all agencies, plus cuts or eliminations.

This would freeze the budget with no increase even for inflation, which would produce savings for the first year of \$34 billion. Some programs would still have to be cut or eliminated in addition, in order to achieve an additional \$16 billion in spending cuts.

The President is opposed to any tax increase until Federal spending is reduced and has promised to veto any tax raising bills.

My opinion is that we must cut at least \$50 billion and I hope that the final budget will be fair, equal, balanced, and committed to a decrease in deficit spending.

Mr. Speaker, I support a balanced budget, but to be honest, I believe that it's impossible for the short range, even though achievable in the long range. Presently we must make a beginning.

I am of the opinion that the majority of the American public is becoming impatient with the administration and with the Congress. The impression that I am receiving is that most groups of citizens will tighten their belts, providing we as a government act in a fair, equal, balanced manner, with a determined commitment to turn around this philosophy we seem to have, which is continued spending beyond our income year after year. I for one am committed in the most serious way to altering this course.

Mr. Speaker, just a short while ago, today this body voted overwhelmingly to freeze the first authorization bill of the 99th Congress at the 1985 level.

Hopefully this will set the pace, and send a signal to all of the authorizing and appropriations committees.

#### RESIDENTS OF EIGHTH DISTRICT OF INDIANA HAVE NO CONGRESSMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. STRANG] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to commend my distinguished

colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND], for his remarks concerning Patricia Harris, a very great American, and I would like to associate myself with his remarks.

I would also like to associate myself with the bulk of the comments of my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. RAY]. It seems to me that if we do not start talking about balancing our budgets in this country and getting our house in order, we will not have a house.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss the disputed set of circumstances around the election in the Eighth District of Indiana, a district which presently has no Congressman represented in this House.

This afternoon we had an opportunity to vote on the first major budget appropriation bill of the 99th Congress, and it seems to me that this body did something very responsible. We voted for a budget freeze. That is probably the action that many of the Members of this House would like to have done in the future during this session, and it is certainly an action that meets with the approval of the bulk of the citizens of the United States.

The residents of the Eighth District of Indiana have no opportunity to share in that joy, Mr. Speaker, because they have no Congressman. They have no Congressman at all.

On election night, November 6, 1984, press reports of the results in the race for Congress in Indiana's Eighth District indicated that Republican Richard McIntyre was leading Democrat Frank McCloskey by more than 100 votes. Tabulation errors were then discovered in two counties during the 10-day period provided by Indiana law for the correction of errors. On the day after the election, November 7, the county clerk retabulated the result in Vanderburgh County before providing certified totals to the Indiana secretary of state. The retabulation added almost 200 votes to McCloskey's total, indicating a 72-vote lead districtwide for McCloskey. Two days later, on November 9, it was discovered that Gibson County had also made a tabulation error, a simple and obvious machine counting error.

□ 2050

Two precincts had been counted twice, incorrectly inflating the McCloskey margin by 111 votes. The correct tabulation in Gibson County gave McIntyre a 39-vote, districtwide lead based upon election night returns.

Correction of the Vanderburgh County error was made before certification was sent to the Indiana secretary of state. The Gibson County clerk, however, had already sent a certificate bearing the incorrect totals. Although admitting the error, the

clerk, a Democrat, refused to correct the certificate.

McIntyre filed a mandamus action to require the Gibson County clerk to correct the error. The action was pursuant to a specific statutory remedy to correct certification errors in Indiana Election Code Section 3-1-26-7, and was entirely apart from Indiana's statutory recount process.

The Indiana secretary of state was notified of the action filed by McIntyre; he decided to delay certification of the winner in the Eighth District, pending resolution of the Gibson County error under the statutory remedy.

McIntyre was also granted a temporary injunction by the Marion County Court of Indianapolis to prevent the secretary of state from certifying McCloskey based on incorrect totals. McCloskey opposed the Gibson County mandamus action on the grounds that only a recount could correct the mistake. The judge in Gibson County, also, a Democrat, dismissed the mandamus action, and ordered a recount to begin. McIntyre appealed the dismissal.

The Indiana Supreme Court, on November 29 decided the issue in favor of the McIntyre position to correct the election night errors and against the McCloskey position to rely exclusively upon a recount. The State supreme court ordered the Gibson County Court to accept jurisdiction and recognize the statutory mandamus remedy and to decide upon the request for a mandamus order to correct the election results separately from the recount.

However, the county recount was completed by the time the Gibson County Court reassumed the jurisdiction, officially acknowledged error in the county returns, and granted the mandamus on December 10. The Gibson County clerk then sent a certified, corrected certificate, a corrected certificate, to the Indiana secretary of state, which verified the original tabulation error, but also reflected the results of the recount, in which McIntyre lost five votes by other tabulation corrections. McIntyre now led McCloskey by 34 votes.

During this same time McCloskey had filed a complaint before Judge Brooks in the U.S. District Court in Evansville seeking two injunctions. First, he requested an order directing the Indiana secretary of state to certify him the winner by 72 votes, arguing that the secretary must certify a winner based upon the county certificate then in his possession, no matter how clearly erroneous those totals were known to be.

Second, McCloskey sought an order to prevent the conducting of the recount requested by McIntyre. Mr. Speaker, this was a request to ask a

public official to certify results which were known to be erroneous. Hardly a high standard of conduct for any public official or anybody seeking public office.

Judge Brooks denied both injunctions after a lengthy hearing during which both McCloskey and the Indiana secretary of state testified. Upon receipt of the corrected Gibson County totals on December 13, as required by Indiana law, the Indiana secretary of state immediately issued a certificate naming Richard McIntyre the winner.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the floor of this House, we were treated to a lot of debate on the McIntyre-McCloskey situation. One of the points that was not brought out clearly is that there is no contest in this election. Mr. McCloskey has never contested the results of this election, and he lost. The State of Indiana has never contested this election. The contest, Mr. Speaker, seems to rest between one individual, Richard McIntyre, who has the certificate from the State of Indiana certifying that he won the race between Mr. McIntyre and the House of Representatives which has presumed to intrude upon the electoral process of the sovereign State of Indiana. And to presume on the process of counting votes in flagrant defiance of Indiana law. So the contest, Mr. Speaker, if it is a contested election, is between Mr. McIntyre and this House of Representatives denying 500,000 people in the State of Indiana any representation on the House of Representatives.

During the debate yesterday, my distinguished colleague, my distinguished colleague from Arkansas, Mr. ALEXANDER, entered into the RECORD what was purported to be the substance of a new Indiana election law, and I think that Mr. ALEXANDER is as anxious as I am to understand the full nature of what was inserted into the RECORD.

According to the chief of elections in the State of Indiana, the only thing worth pointing out in this particular issue is that the section inserted into the RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas is not part of the current bill.

The section that was talked about by my distinguished colleague from Arkansas, Mr. ALEXANDER, was deleted in the Senate, and no part of the bill now in conference committee contains any sections on voter intent. Mr. Speaker, I felt obligated to be sure that my distinguished colleague knew the true facts, rather than the facts that were inserted into the RECORD on April 2.

There was a full and fair count of the votes in Indiana and the count was conducted under the laws of the sovereign State of Indiana. Not a single shred of evidence has ever been produced to suggest that the certificate of election naming McIntyre the winner was not based on a full, fair counting

of the votes on election day. Any confusion as to the outcome of the Eighth District race for Congress is a result of the deliberate refusal of House Democrats to investigate their own, unsubstantiated allegations.

The presumption in favor of McIntyre's certificate and Indiana's electoral process has never been overcome by any showing of proof. No election irregularities have been alleged by either of the candidates in Indiana's Eighth District. No election irregularities have ever been alleged by either of the candidates. Either by the winner, Mr. McIntyre, who won by 34 votes, or by the loser, Mr. McCloskey, who lost by 34 votes. So why, Mr. Speaker, must we deny the 500,000 residents of the Eighth District of Indiana the right to have a Congressman in this Congress when we are voting on matters that affect them directly, particularly matters that relate to taxation. That is taxation without representation. Who was the winner on election night? McCloskey was not the winner. No official who ever had the right to declare a winner on that election ever certified McCloskey as the winner; no official. Because the only person who is allowed to certify the winner in election in the State of Indiana, in a congressional election, is the secretary of state.

McCloskey only appeared to be in the lead for about 2 days during the week after the election, prior to the discovery of errors in the Gibson County tabulation; a precinct was counted twice. A precinct was counted twice. One of the suits filed asked the secretary of state of Indiana to certify a candidate based on known errors, not a high standard of conduct for anybody in public office or seeking public office.

McCloskey never had an official lead by those guidelines.

□ 2100

McIntyre's certificate of election was based on corrected election day returns, not on any recount certificates; corrected election day returns. McCloskey did not win on election day only to have his victory overturned by McIntyre in the recount.

Mr. Speaker, McCloskey never won the election, nor has he ever contested that, and the 500,000 people in the Eighth District of Indiana sit there and know that that race was won and they sent a man to this Congress, McIntyre, with a certificate, and this body refused to seat him.

We have flouted the laws of the sovereign State of Indiana and we continue to do so. We have shown a degree of contempt for the processes in one of our 50 States. That, Mr. Speaker, is a shame. That is a disgrace.

Mr. MONSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRANG. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MONSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and more importantly, I appreciate the material and the thoughts that he entered into the RECORD this evening that help to clarify the situation as it occurred in Indiana. Being one who does not like to see a situation complicated if it is not necessary, I have been very troubled by this whole event and I appreciate very much the sequence of events in Indiana being clarified for us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has troubled me most about what has transpired in the 3 months since Mr. McIntyre has been denied his seat is the reference that is made to the disenfranchisement of over 5,000 voters in that State. This occurred during the recount that took place when the questions began to be raised as to whether or not the 34-vote margin that Mr. McIntyre received on election night was sufficient and whether or not there were irregularities, so a recount was asked for, and it is true that about 5,000 votes were thrown out in the process of that recount.

The thing that troubles me is that those on the other side of the aisle would have us believe that somehow if we count those 5,000 votes, Mr. McCloskey is going to emerge the winner. They seem to feel that 5,000 people who they claim were disenfranchised are going to change the outcome of the election.

As you have so very ably pointed out this evening, you count all those votes that were thrown out during the process of the recount and Mr. McIntyre still wins by 34 votes. Let them count the 5,000 votes. Mr. McIntyre still wins. We do not need to worry about that. If they are so concerned about being disenfranchised, we will count them. He still wins, and that is the thing that is not being addressed in the conversation that takes place on the floor of this House when this subject is brought to a vote. Each time they have tried to mislead the voters of that State and of the Nation into believing that somehow those 5,000 votes are going to change the outcome. They do not, and we need to dispel that rumor once and for all.

Mr. STRANG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MONSON. If the gentleman will yield further, I also think that it is important that we point out that those 5,000 votes were not in question on January 3; that Mr. McIntyre was denied his seat in Congress without those 5,000 votes coming into question. Those have only come into question since January 3, since the recount has been completed and it became known that 5,000 votes has in fact been thrown out.



So again we are being led into believing that that was a factor in the first instance where Mr. McIntyre was denied his seat. Once again we have a situation that does not tell the true story to the American people.

I am reminded of a basketball game that was held a few years ago between the Soviet Union and the United States. At the end of the regulation game, the United States was ahead, but somehow it was decided that the last few seconds of that game should be replayed. Once again the United States emerged the winner. Somehow it was decided they should replay it again. Eventually the Soviet Union emerged as the winner. At that point they quit.

The thing that is different in this situation from that basketball game is that at least the same rules were applying as they continued that game, even though they should not have continued it as many times as they did. In this instance, we are continuing the game, but we are also changing the rules in the process of continuing that game. We are going back and we are saying that the rules that were in place on November 6, are somehow wrong and that those rules need to be changed in order to have a fair election.

Whether those rules are wrong or not is not really the issue. We should not change the rules of a game after a game has been played. We need to play by the same rules. Now, whether or not Indiana's laws are inadequate and unfair remains to be seen, but again, as the gentleman has just pointed out, even the State legislature of Indiana has not found any reason yet during their session to question whether those rules need to be changed. In fact, the only attempt that has been made to change those rules has left, in essence, the same rules that they already had, and as I understand it, the bill that is before the State legislature of Indiana would only deal with computerized ballots and has no reference at all to recounts or anything of that nature that might indicate that they feel that their own laws are inadequate in this situation.

So once again we are being led to believe that rules are inadequate and unfair when, in fact, the State of Indiana does not even apparently believe that. They are not making any effort to change them, and as was very well pointed out yesterday by our distinguished colleague from California, Mr. THOMAS, 15 or 16 other States have rules very similar to those used in Indiana and they have not found any reason to change their rules yet either.

So the only way you can justify changing these rules is if you want to change the outcome of the game after it has been played, and that appears to be what is happening here. The precedents

that we are setting are disastrous to our country. They say that we in this House of Representatives can decide who the winner of an election is, not whether the qualifications of that person are adequate, but who actually won the election, and we can even go to the extent that it is necessary to change rules in order to come out with the winner that we want.

We cannot allow this to happen. We cannot allow the process that has served this country so well of allowing the States to conduct their elections and to tell us who the winners of those elections are to be superceded.

Mr. STRANG. I thank the gentleman from Utah, and I would like to, Mr. Speaker, run down very briefly the issue that is central to this entire discussion. The issue is that a sovereign State, the sovereign State of Indiana, certified legally a Congressman. He won an election. They sent him here and this House has refused to recognize the validity of that certificate.

□ 2110

Indiana law does not require the secretary of state to certify the winning candidate within 10 days after election, as has been alleged over on this side, Mr. Speaker, constantly. The law is that he must wait 10 days, and in fact the bulk of the certification done after the November 6 election for congressional candidates was done on November 26, 20 days after the election. Indiana law in fact prevents the secretary of state from certifying a winning candidate until a 10-day period after the election has passed to permit recanvassing of the votes and the correction of errors at the county level.

That is exactly what happened in the Eighth District of Indiana. The precincts of Gibson County were canvassed, were found to be in error, and were recounted—"retabulated" is really the word.

Indiana law does not require the secretary of state to certify a winning candidate based on county certificates he knows to represent incorrect totals. The secretary of state of Indiana, Mr. Speaker, certified McIntyre the winner based upon corrected election day totals, not on the basis of any recount certificate from any county. They were corrected totals. No court has ever questioned the validity of the certificate issued to McIntyre by the Indiana secretary of state, and Mr. McCloskey, who lost the election, has never contested that certificate.

This is a dangerous precedent, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRANG. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I am hopeful that the gentleman can clear up some confusion that exists in my mind, and that confusion, I say to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. STRANG], is this: The leadership for the majority, the Democratic Party in the House, claims that there is confusion about the results of this election on election night.

I am wondering if the gentleman from Colorado knows what that claim is based on, what evidence it is based on?

Mr. STRANG. The claims by this House of Representatives, as led by the majority party, have created deliberate confusion.

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it seems to me that this is a big, big bootstrap operation. I remember on January 3 the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT], made this statement when he introduced House Resolution 1:

... that the election procedures employed in the Eighth Congressional District have been neither timely nor regular and serious questions have been raised as to their fairness. The election procedures to date have simply not yielded a result on which the House can judge.

I am quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am a lawyer, and I have been involved in this and I thought perhaps I missed something, but in my heart and in my mind I know that not a shred of evidence has ever been produced to suggest that the results on election night or the certificate of election naming McIntyre the winner were not based upon a full and fair counting of those votes on election day.

Does the gentleman disagree with that?

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and he is absolutely correct.

Mr. Speaker, the only way the election in Indiana can be changed is, as my colleague, the gentleman from Utah, observes, to change the rules. The State of Indiana has laws, as do all the States, and they follow those laws, Mr. Speaker.

They sent us a certified winner. This House has a right under its rules to question and analyze the results of any election of any Member, and it is proper that it do so, but it is not proper, Mr. Speaker, that they refuse to seat the gentleman who has the only existing certificate of winning the election in the Eighth Congressional District of the State of Indiana. Mr. McIntyre is legally the winner, pending evidence that there were irregularities or that the election was falsely won.

The issue is not whether this House has the right to conduct an investigation. This House does have that right. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA],

for whom I have extraordinarily high regard, is working as hard as he knows how to analyze what happened in the State of Indiana, to analyze if there were problems with the ballots, and to analyze if there were problems with the election in any way. That is the right of this House. What is not the right of this House and what is a blatant attempt to grab a seat is to change the rules, to ignore the laws of the State of Indiana governing election, and to deny Richard McIntyre the seat that even his defeated opponent, Mr. McCloskey, has not contested, a seat which was won by a very close count of 34 votes.

That is close, Mr. Speaker. I agree with that. But the recount being conducted by the task force is a blatant and unfair attempt to give the loser a third chance. There is no provision in Indiana law which permits anybody to change the methods of counting specified under that law. There is no such provision. Consequently, the House of Representatives is intruding into the sovereign rights of the State of Indiana.

The examination of elections is our right. Our rules say that we can look at anybody's election. But, Mr. Speaker, the precedent being set here for the first time in 200 years is this: For the first time, despite the smoke-screen of precedent, they have said—

We don't care what a State says about its candidate. We don't care if they have a certificate. We choose not to seat this one because he comes from the wrong party.

That is what this is all about. He comes from the wrong party. Mr. Speaker, that shoe can go on both feet, and if I were another Member, I personally would feel threatened by that.

Mr. Speaker, last November I was blessed not to have a close election. I won by some 3,200 or 3,000 votes in a Democratic district. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the point. If you can deny the validity of any State's election process and take a seat away from a certified winner with 34 votes, why can you not do it with 34,000? Where do you draw the line, Mr. Speaker? This is a crass and crude attempt to grab power, to take a seat through raw, brutal political power.

Mr. Speaker, unless any other of my colleagues wish to have me yield to them, I shall yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DELLUMS (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RIDGE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. IRELAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMERSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. STRANG, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLPE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DINGELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ECKART of Ohio, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK, for 60 minutes, April 16.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. LOWERY of California, immediately prior to the vote on the Walker substitute amendment to H.R. 1714, National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1986, in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RIDGE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HYDE.

Mr. RITTER in three instances.

Mr. MCKERNAN.

Mr. GREGG.

Mr. RINALDO.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. PARRIS.

Mr. FRENZEL in two instances.

Mrs. HOLT.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. GRADISON.

Mr. KEMP in two instances.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. BOEHLERT.

Mr. HILLIS.

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut.

Mr. SHUMWAY in two instances.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in two instances.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. CHENEY.

Mr. DAUB.

Mr. MACK.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLPE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. FLORIO.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

Mr. MILLER of California in six instances.

Mr. FUSTER.

Mr. SIKORSKI.

Mr. GEPHARDT.

Mr. LEVINE of California.

Mr. ADDABBO.

Mr. ST GERMAIN.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York.

Mr. RANGEL in six instances.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

Mr. BARNES.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. LUNDINE.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia.

Mr. FRANK.

Mr. MARKEY in two instances.

Mr. LUKEN.

Ms. MIKULSKI.

Mr. ACKERMAN in two instances.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. SOLARZ in two instances.

Mr. LaFALCE.

Mr. AuCOIN.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Ms. OAKAR in two instances.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. STARK in three instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. GARCIA.

Mr. HUBBARD.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. BONKER.

Mr. DERRICK.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. CHAPPELL.

#### ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1239. An act making urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, for emergency famine relief and recovery in Africa, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to designate the week of September 8, 1985, as "National Independent Retail Grocer Week"; and

H.J. Res. 186. Joint resolution designating April 2, 1985, as "Education Day, U.S.A."



### SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 781. An act to amend the Biomass Energy and Alcohol Fuels Act of 1980 to clarify the intention of section 221 of the act;

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 21 through April 27, 1985, as "National Organ Donation Awareness Week";

S.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to designate the week of April 1, 1985, through April 7, 1985, as "World Health Week," and to designate April 7, 1985 as "World Health Day";

S.J. Res. 62. Joint resolution commemorating the 25th anniversary of U.S. weather satellites; and

S.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to designate April 1985 as "Fair Housing Month."

### JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, Joint Resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 121. Joint resolution to designate the month of April 1985 as "National Child Abuse Prevention Month";

H.J. Res. 134. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to designate the week of March 10 through 16, 1985, as "National Employ-the-Older-Worker Week"; and

H.J. Res. 160. Joint resolution designating March 22, 1985, as "National Energy Education Day."

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 4, 1985, at 11 o'clock a.m.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

964. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the 1985-86 guaranteed student loan family contribution schedule, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1078nt. (Public Law 97-301, 9(c) (97 Stat. 481)); 20 U.S.C. 1089(a)(2); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

965. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report on the business of the Department of Justice for the last preceding fiscal year, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 522; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

966. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 901(b) of the

Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

967. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the foreign acquisition of subsidized U.S.-flag vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

968. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve the interstate cost estimate and permit the apportionment of funds authorized for fiscal year 1987; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

969. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to repeal provisions relating to setting the interest rate on guaranteed or insured housing loans to veterans and inspecting manufactured homes purchased by veterans, to increase the VA loan fee, to authorize direct appropriations to the loan guaranty revolving fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

970. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting revised regulations governing operations under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as published in the Federal Register on January 23, 1985, pursuant to the act of July 10, 1954, chapter 469, section 408(d) (91 Stat. 957); jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UDALL. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1088. A bill to impose quantitative limitations on the importation of Canadian softwood for a 5-year period, to require an investigation, report, and recommendations on the management of the National Forest System, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-37, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 1930. A bill to provide for the tax treatment of the transfer of ownership of the Consolidated Rail Corporation [Conrail] to the private sector, to amend the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 with respect to such transfer, and for other purposes; divided and referred as follows: title I to the Committee on Ways and Means; and title II to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MACKEY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. GILMAN):

H.R. 1931. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information

Agency, the Board of International Broadcasting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ARMEY (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. MONSON, Mr. COBEY, and Mr. CRAIG):

H.R. 1932. A bill to authorize tax incentives for urban enterprise zones, youth employment opportunity wages, a program of urban homesteading, and to improve equal educational opportunity; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means; Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; the Judiciary; and Education and Labor.

By Mr. BREAU (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1933. A bill to amend the Central, Western, and South Pacific Fisheries Development Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CHENEY:

H.R. 1934. A bill entitled, the "Mineral Lands Leasing Act Amendments of 1985"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 1935. A bill to provide for daylight saving time on an expanded basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1936. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to establish fees for certain Coast Guard services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 1937. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to provide a qualified immunity for certain officers and employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 1938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that interest credited on a deposit or account in a bank or other financial institution shall not be included in income if such interest cannot be withdrawn because of a bankruptcy or other insolvency proceeding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of Iowa (for himself, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. FRANKLIN):

H.R. 1939. A bill to provide for shipment of a percentage imported agriculturally related products on vessels of U.S. registry and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FAZIO (for himself, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. MOODY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. STUDDS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. RODINO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BEILINSON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BARNES, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. TORRES, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. ROE, and Mr. SABO):

H.R. 1940. A bill to clarify certain responsibilities of the Department of Defense under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

of 1980, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Public Works and Transportation, and Armed Services.

By Ms. FIEDLER (for herself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. FISH, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LAGOMARINO, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GROTH, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BADHAM, and Mr. KRAMER):

H.R. 1941. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make funds available to the small business community; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 1942. A bill to prohibit the enforcement of certain interstate compacts, which may be discriminatory in nature, and to which Congress has not granted its consent; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FUSTER:

H.R. 1943. A bill to include Puerto Rico within the definition of State for purposes of the requirement imposed on the Secretary of the Treasury to withhold State income taxes from the income of Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 1944. A bill to impose a surcharge on the importation of Japanese products until such time as the President determines that Japan has made significant progress in eliminating its nontariff barriers to American products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUBBARD:

H.R. 1945. A bill to strengthen certain currency reporting requirements; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1946. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to provide mandatory penalties for certain drug offenses involving the importation or exportation, or the manufacture, of controlled substances; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KENNELLY (for herself, Mr. PEASE, Mr. CLINGER, Ms. OAKAR, and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 1947. A bill to promote training programs for individuals receiving unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUNDINE (for himself, and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 1948. A bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, and the African Development Fund; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. McHUGH (for himself, and Mr. LUNDINE):

H.R. 1949. A bill to provide for a U.S. contribution to the special facility for Sub-Saharan Africa administered by the International Development Association; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GUARINI (for himself, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 1950. A bill to give the Nation's performance in international trade appropriately greater importance in the formulation of Government policy, to modernize the

remedies available to U.S. producers regarding unfair and injurious foreign trade practices, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 1951. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report to the Congress regarding accidents involving military aircraft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.R. 1952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage individuals to make long-term equity investments in small companies by reducing the capital gains tax on such investments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1953. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the Medicare prospective payment transition period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, and Mr. THOMAS of California):

H.R. 1954. A bill to provide that the provisions of section 252 of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 (relating to transfers of property to employees subject to certain restrictions) shall apply to certain transfers occurring during 1973; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. ZSCHAU):

H.R. 1955. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that income otherwise eligible to be taken into account in computing the section 936 credit shall not be ineligible merely by reason of being received in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICA (by request):

H.R. 1956. A bill to amend and extend the Hostage Relief Act of 1980, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Post Office and Civil Service, and Ways and Means.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

H.R. 1957. A bill to amend title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 1958. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Ocean Pollution Planning Act of 1978 and title II of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 for the fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Science and Technology.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 1959. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BATES, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. WOLPE):

H.R. 1960. A bill to amend the act of February 25, 1920, commonly known as the Mineral Leasing Act, to require competitive bidding for leases on Federal lands with oil or gas deposits, and to require diligent ex-

ploration for, and development and production of, such oil or gas deposits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 1961. A bill to amend Section 16 of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN (for himself, Mr. APPELGATE, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 1962. A bill to designate U.S. Route 22 By-Pass in Weirton, WV, as a priority primary route; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MURTHA:

H.R. 1963. A bill to increase the development ceiling at Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site and Johnstown Flood National Memorial in Pennsylvania, and for other purposes and to provide for the preservation and interpretation of the Johnstown Flood Museum in the Cambria County Library Building, PA; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Ms. OAKAR:

H.R. 1964. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that certain periods outside of a regularly scheduled administrative workweek during which a Federal employee is required to travel shall be taken into account for purposes of determinations relating to overtime; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EMERSON (for himself, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. EVANS, of Iowa, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WOLFE, and Mr. WORTLEY):

H.R. 1965. A bill to provide market expansion and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Ms. OAKAR (for herself, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 1966. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Spouse Equity Act of 1984 and for other purpose; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 1967. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a grant program to provide assistance to States in providing veterans with advice and assistance concerning veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 1968. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase to \$150,000 the amount of group term life insurance which may be provided by an employer and excluded from the gross income of an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 1969. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase to 32 cents per pack the excise taxes on cigarettes and to amend title XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for the use of the increased cigarette tax revenues for purpose of the medicare and medicaid programs and to reduce the Federal deficit; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1970. A bill to amend part B of title XI of the Social Security Act to improve the quality assurances system as it applies to



Medicare beneficiaries; jointly, to the Committee on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 1971. A bill to encourage all depository institutions to apply for Federal deposit insurance; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SIKORSKI (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. FUSTER):

H.R. 1972. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Amendments of 1984 to encourage States to enact child protection reforms which are designed to improve legal and administrative proceedings regarding the investigation and prosecution of sexual child abuse cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. AL-EXANDER, Mr. SUNDRIST, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. McKERNAN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CARR, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. ROSE, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. PRICE, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. OLIN, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. COBEY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia):

H.R. 1973. A bill to provide for orderly trade in nonrubber footwear, to reduce unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 1974. A bill to require that not more than one-fifth of the budget authority of any department or agency of the executive branch may be obligated during the last 2 calendar months of a fiscal year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1975. A bill to improve the procedures for citizens to bring to trial those making fraudulent claims on the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1976. A bill to amend the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act to provide that a country may not be designated as a beneficiary country under such act unless it enters into an agreement with the United States providing for the exchange of tax information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAUKE (for himself, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. COATS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. NELSON of Utah, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RITTER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. RALPH H. HALL, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. LUKE, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ECKERT of New York, Mr. DANNE-MEYER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. HEFNER, Mr.

QUILLEN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. PUQUA, Mr. PENNY, Mr. KINDNESS, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. McKERNAN, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi):

H.R. 1977. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to establish new procedures for the renewal, assignment, and transfer of broadcast licenses, to provide certain deregulation of broadcast services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TORRES (for himself, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

H.R. 1978. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (Superfund) to reduce the danger caused by the disposal of hazardous waste, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Public Works and Transportation, and Science and Technology.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 1979. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the National Housing Act, and the Federal Credit Union Act to restrict the manner in which federally insured depository institutions may increase fees on individual retirement accounts; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1980. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit the delivery of mail to certain residential dwellings by the use of outdoor clusterboxes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BONIOR of Michigan (for himself, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

H.J. Res. 227. Joint resolution designating the week of June 23, 1985, through June 29, 1985, as "Helen Keller Deaf-Blind Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. WALKER, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARNES, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LELAND, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WHEAT):

H.J. Res. 228. Joint resolution condemning the violence of apartheid in South Africa and requesting an investigation by the Secretary of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERTEL of Michigan (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr.

BEVILL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARR, Mr. COELHO, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EARLY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REID, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. WORTLEY):

H.J. Res. 229. Joint resolution designating the week beginning September 22, 1985, as "National Adult Day Care Center Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to establish a commission to study amusement ride safety; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT):

H.J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to designate July 6, 1986, "National Air Traffic Control Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.J. Res. 232. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Illiteracy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VENTO:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the problem of homelessness in the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself, Mr.

ARMEY, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GRINGRICH, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MACK, Mr. MONSON, Mr. MONT-

GOMERY, Mr. REID, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. ZSCHAU:

H. Res. 125. Resolution condemning the Government of the Soviet Union for the murder of Maj. Arthur D. Nicholson, Jr., and actions clearly inconsistent with the 1947 Military Liaison Missions Agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENEY:

H.R. 1981. A bill for the relief of Lawrence K. Lunt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 1982. A bill for the relief of Simon Marriott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 26: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 52: Mr. ROSE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, and Mr. HUTTO.

H.R. 68: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. DASCHLE, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 283: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. DASCHLE, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 320: Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. FROST, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 333: Mr. MARLENEE, Mrs. BYRON, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 343: Mr. BADHAM.

H.R. 346: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 351: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 383: Mr. McMILLAN.

H.R. 385: Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. COBEY.

H.R. 445: Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 479: Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 507: Mr. LEHMAN of California.

H.R. 589: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 695: Mr. LUNGREN.

H.R. 814: Mr. BADHAM.

H.R. 822: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BATES, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CLAY of Missouri, Mr. COELHO, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. EARLY, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr.

HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HOYER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. McHUGH, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALGREEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. WISE, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. YATES, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, and Mr. ZSCHAU.

H.R. 840: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. LEVINE of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. DANIEL.

H.R. 841: Mr. MANTON, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. ROE, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FRANK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 871: Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 877: Mr. PURSELL.

H.R. 890: Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 891: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 893: Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.R. 918: Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 933: Mr. FISH, Mr. BIAGGI, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. MINETA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. PURSELL.

H.R. 945: Mr. McHUGH, Mr. SILJANDER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. CHAPPELL, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 975: Mr. BLAZ and Mr. LENT.

H.R. 980: Mr. MURPHY and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1042: Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. STRANG.

H.R. 1050: Mr. WILSON, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. ROE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. DAVIS.

H.R. 1059: Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 1124: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. GEPHARDT.

H.R. 1142: Mr. PURSELL and Mr. SHARP.

H.R. 1161: Mr. WHITEHURST.

H.R. 1180: Mr. MONSON.

H.R. 1222: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1247: Mr. STUMP, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HILER, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. KASICH, Mr. SKEEN, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. LUN-

GREN, Mr. STRANG, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1258: Mr. BADHAM.

H.R. 1309: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. TORRES, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1318: Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 1379: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1380: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BONKER, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 1395: Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1435: Mr. ROE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. COURTER, Mr. STARK, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. EVANS of Illinois.

H.R. 1482: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BERMAN, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1520: Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RUDD, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. REID, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. MONSON.

H.R. 1550: Mr. BEDELL.

H.R. 1594: Mr. WEAVER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. YATES, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. BEDELL.

H.R. 1595: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. MONSON.

H.R. 1607: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. COELHO, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1684: Mr. WOLF, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 1724: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1763: Mr. WHITEHURST and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1824: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1825: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1826: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1827: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1828: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 7: Mr. DEWINE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, and Mr. BADHAM.

H.J. Res. 33: Mr. DYSON.

H.J. Res. 77: Mr. FUGUA, Mr. DEWINE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ROSE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. EARLY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SABO, Mr. DAUB,



Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FISH, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GALLO, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. ROEMER, Ms. OAKAR, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.J. Res. 87: Mr. SKELTON.

H.J. Res. 88: Mr. FRANK, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. WISE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. SABO.

H.J. Res. 94: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.J. Res. 101: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. FISH.

H.J. Res. 108: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. DE LA GARZA.

H.J. Res. 127: Mr. BRYANT.

H.J. Res. 136: Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HENRY, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. LUKE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BONKER, Mr. FISH, Mr. MACKEY, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. COURTER.

H.J. Res. 154: Mr. WYLIE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HOYER, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. GALLO, Mr.

HAYES, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. DANIEL, and Mr. DASCHLE.

H.J. Res. 175: Mrs. HOLT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. PURSELL.

H.J. Res. 202: Mr. DAUB and Mr. ROE.

H. Con. Res. 93: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. BEDELL.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. HYDE, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. WEBER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. MACKEY.

H. Con. Res. 106: Mrs. BENTLEY and Mr. KLECZKA.

H. Res. 60: Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. PACKARD.

H. Res. 68: Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. FISH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DIODUARDI, and Mr. ADDABBO.

H. Res. 72: Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. STRATTON, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GRAY of Illinois,

Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PRICE, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. YATRON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. PEASE, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H. Res. 94: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. OAKAR.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1401: Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 1402: Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 1403: Mr. ROSE.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

76. The Speaker presented a petition of Erwin W. Watkins, attorney at law, Shaker Heights, OH, relative to the Equal Employment Opportunity Act; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.